



Reflections on the Boyar Duma in the Reign of Ivan III

Author(s): Gustave Alef

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 45, No. 104 (Jan., 1967), pp. 76-123

Published by: the [Modern Humanities Research Association](#) and [University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4205832>

Accessed: 15/06/2014 03:59

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Reflections on the Boyar Duma in the Reign of Ivan III*

GUSTAVE ALEF

CONSIDERABLE pressures for administrative change developed at the Muscovite court in the second half of the 15th century. The realm tripled in size, increasing from an area of 190,000 square miles in 1462 to well over 600,000 in 1505. A defensive yet active foreign policy during the early years of Ivan III's reign later turned belligerent and expansionist and necessitated an enlarged and reorganised army. A commensurate increase in diplomatic activity called into being a more professional corps of envoys, a growing cadre of translators and interpreters, and an expanding subsection of the treasury, replete with clerks and scribes, which preserved documents and catalogues of instructions given to the various embassies. The same period witnessed an expansion of princely power. In this late medieval principality of state-like proportions, the court had to face growing problems of jurisdiction and administration, of developing methods to ensure loyalty on the part of new or sometimes reluctant subjects, and of financing growing commitments in a relatively poor realm. Above all, there were the questions of tax collection and the judicial competence of the crown.

Undoubtedly impressed by a comment made by Ilovaysky in the late 19th century, the late Stepan Veselovsky remarked that in the 14th century, when small principalities dotted the area of north-eastern Rus', a reigning prince knew his important people by sight and name; his servitors always had access to him. The incorporation of surrounding territories into an enlarged Muscovy swelled the ranks of the serving class, making impossible the continuance of the earlier close relationship. This led to impersonalisation—to a system wherein the ordinary servitor turned into a name on a list, rather than a familiar to whom solicitude and favour could be shown.¹

Territorial growth also affected the manner in which the realm was administered. The personal supervision of the grand prince gradually gave way to reliance upon designated lieutenants and record-keeping clerks. According to Ambrogio Contarini, a Venetian

* I am indebted to the Institute for Advanced Study and to the University of Oregon Graduate School for support which made this study possible. A generalised version was presented at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies held in New York in April 1964.

¹ S. B. Veselovsky, *Feodal'noye zemlevladieniye v severo-vostochnoy Rusi*, I, Moscow/Leningrad, 1947, p. 306; for an earlier suggestion along the same line, see D. Ilovaysky, *Istoriya Rossii*, II: *Moskovsko-Litovskiy period ili sobiratel'i Rusi*, 2nd ed., Moscow, 1896, p. 503.

who visited Moscow in the autumn and early winter of 1476, Ivan III toured 'the various parts of his dominions every year'.² This fortuitous observation we owe to Contarini's frustration. During three of the four months that he spent in Moscow, Ivan III was away visiting parts of his realm.³ These journeys became less frequent in later years as the pressure of business increased in the capital; yet the grand prince continued the practice whenever time allowed to the very end of his life.⁴

While Ivan III may have desired to continue the leisurely practice of his forefathers, the tempo of court activity increased, necessitating an enlargement of the responsibilities assigned to a variety of household officials and the creation of a number of new offices. A rising mound of paper marked the gradual change from oral to written instructions. In the old household treasury, where all valuables were deposited, a special section housed the grand-princely records. In this half-century the offspring outgrew the parent. Here secretaries and scribes toiled ceaselessly, cataloguing and assigning to boxes the originals or copies of all important documents, instructions and reports.

I

Though functionaries, obligations and records multiplied, the basic agency aiding the grand prince in the governance of the realm was his council, the boyar дума. Despite considerable scholarly attention to the competence, functioning and composition of this body throughout its long history, we still lack thorough understanding of the mechanics whereby the Muscovite дума aided centralisa-

² *Travels to Tana and Persia by Josafa Barbaro and Ambrogio Contarini*, Hakluyt Society, First Series, No. 49, London, 1873, p. 159.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 163-4: 'I remained in Moscow from the 25th of September until the 21st of January. . . . After visiting his dominions, the Duke returned to Moscow about the end of December'.

⁴ The information available, culled primarily from the chronicles, is fragmentary. It is not possible to substantiate fully Contarini's statement from this source, although there is enough evidence to suggest that Ivan III tried to visit the various provinces fairly frequently. These visitations occurred in the autumn, after the harvest was in. Here are some indications:

In 1467 he visited Kolomna (*Polnoye sobraniye russkikh letopisey* (hereafter cited as *PSRL*), IV, St Petersburg, 1848, p. 149) and in the following year Vladimir and Pereyaslav' (*ibid.*, IV, p. 149; V, St Petersburg, 1851, p. 174); in late 1475 and early 1476 he was in Novgorod, accompanied by an impressive entourage, including members of the дума (*PSRL*, IV, p. 152; *Drevneyshaya Razryadnaya Kniga ofitsial'noy redaktsii* [po 1565 g.], ed. P. N. Milyukov (hereafter cited as *DRK*), Moscow, 1901, p. 11); in late October (or from 2 December) 1479 to early 1480 he was again in Novgorod (*PSRL*, IV, p. 152; VI, St Petersburg, 1853, pp. 19-20); in late 1481, Vladimir (*Ioasafovskaya letopis'*, ed. A. A. Zimin, Moscow, 1957, p. 123; *PSRL*, IV, 155); from late October 1495 to March 1496 he was in Novgorod (*Ioasafovskaya letopis'*, p. 131; *Sbornik imperatorskago russkago istoricheskago obshchestva* (hereafter cited as *SIRIO*), XLI, ed. G. Karpov, St Petersburg, 1884, No. 48, p. 217); from September to November 1503, Ivan III, accompanied by his sons, visited Pereyaslav', Rostov, and Yaroslav' (*PSRL*, XXVI, Moscow/Leningrad, 1959, p. 296; *Ioasafovskaya letopis'*, pp. 145-6; see also *SIRIO*, XLI, No. 93, p. 497).

tion. After a century of effort, a leading Soviet medievalist, Alexander Zimin, could in truth remark that 'an investigation of the composition of the boyar duma in the 16th century appears to be a necessary precondition for study of the rôles which this central institution played in the administrative apparatus of the Russian centralised state.'⁵ This observation applies equally to the second half of the 15th century.

The standard view of the duma is based on an amalgam of evidence with illustrations chosen to support the arguments of the scholars concerned. A number of historians have subscribed to a provocative thesis, already formed in the early 19th century,⁶ that departure of free servitors from Muscovy to neighbouring principalities became impossible after the consolidation of north-eastern Rus' in the late 15th century. In consequence these formerly free members of the aristocracy were transformed into subservient subjects. Yet an identity of interests between ruler and subjects survived into the early 16th century, and the warrior class lent its energies to the further unification of the growing realm.⁷ Thus personal gain and the continued evolution of the monocratic grand principality worked for the benefit of ruler and well-born subjects alike.

The duma, an institution of early origin, remained as an advisory group. In the period prior to consolidation the opinions of princely councillors carried greater weight, thereby tempering the decisions of local rulers, since the senior advisers could resign their positions, and even leave the service of the territorial prince, if their advice went unheeded.⁸ After consolidation duma members, like the whole of the serving class, lost mobility and their bargaining position weakened.

⁵ A. A. Zimin, 'Sostav boyarskoy dumy v XV-XVI vekakh', *Arkheograficheskiy yezhegodnik za 1957 god* (hereafter cited as *AE 1957*), Moscow, 1958, p. 41.

⁶ N. M. Karamzin, *Istoriya gosudarstva rossiyskago*, ed. P. N. Polevoy, VI, St Petersburg, 1892, pp. 220-1.

⁷ V. O. Klyuchevsky, *Kurs russkoy istorii in Sochineniya*, II, Moscow, 1957, pp. 139 ff.; *idem*, *Istoriya sssloviy v Rossii in Sochineniya*, VI, Moscow, 1959, pp. 365 ff.; earlier S. M. Solov'yov, the teacher of Klyuchevsky, had already hinted at this thesis (*Istoriya Rossii s drevneyshikh vremyon*, VII, Moscow, 1962, pp. 30-1) and undoubtedly this underlay the expansion of the idea by his brilliant student. N. P. Zagoskin (*Istoriya prava Moskovskago gosudarstva*, I, Kazan', 1877) also divided earlier Russian history into two parts: the pre-Muscovite and the Muscovite tsardom. The monocratic and autocratic period had already begun to form after 1462. Though he deals with slightly differing factors—placing greater emphasis upon the reasons for unification rather than its consequences (pp. 1-27)—Zagoskin reaches the same conclusion as Solov'yov and Klyuchevsky in discussing the effects upon the system of government and the restricted sphere of activity by the service aristocracy and the boyar duma (I, pp. 140 ff., II, p. 25). See also A. E. Presnyakov, *Moskovskoye tsarstvo*, Petrograd, 1918, pp. 42 ff.; Ilovaysky, *Istoriya Rossii*, II, p. 503; V. Sergeyevich, *Lektsii i izsledovaniya po drevney istorii Russkago prava*, 3rd ed., St Petersburg, 1903, p. 259.

⁸ M. K. Lyubavsky, *Drevnyaya russkaya istoriya do kontsa XVI v.*, Moscow, 1918, pp. 236-7; M. F. Vladimirovsky-Budanov, *Obzor istorii russkago prava*, 3rd ed., Kiev/St Petersburg, 1900, p. 173.

In consequence they became simple councillors, whose judgements might not be valued.⁹ Students of Russian law in the past century, who were interested in the theory of power, contended that the princely дума never really acquired an independent constitutional existence. It was a customary institution with only advisory functions. The power of the princes, and later of the Muscovite monarch, was absolute, based upon divine sanction; he did not have to rely upon the advice of his councillors, although he may have done so out of respect for their superior judgement or, prior to unification, to maintain the loyalty of able warriors with their retainers.¹⁰

Throughout the history of the дума its members aided the princely ruler in affairs of administration and justice.¹¹ Vladimirsky-Budanov stressed that even in the period of developing 'monocracy' Ivan III insisted that the boyars had to sanction all important decisions, such as the grand prince's marriage to Zoe Palaeologa or the attack on Novgorod in 1471.¹² Sergeyevich suggested that the дума did not decide important issues, but only replied to questions put to it by the ruler.¹³ There was a general consensus among late 19th-century juridical historians that Ivan III was respectful and tolerant of his councillors, and even rewarded those who took issue with him, while his son Vasily III punished those who flouted his opinions.¹⁴ Klyuchevsky believed that Ivan III consulted his boyars on momentous occasions, but that in more stable periods he assigned some дума members to provincial administrative positions, where they acted as governors or generals. The remainder took up court positions. The purpose of sending out дума members as regional agents was to take over administrative and judicial functions from local authorities.¹⁵ With a slightly different twist, Vladimirsky-Budanov saw the governorship of towns and districts as a means of administering localities and also as rewards for faithful service, which allowed the holders to enrich themselves by 'feeding' off the local inhabitants.¹⁶

In his recent study of early modern Muscovy, George Vernadsky took a completely different view. He ascribed omnicompetent powers to Ivan III's дума. The boyars 'ruled Russia jointly with the grand

⁹ Lyubavsky, *Drevnyaya russkaya istoriya*, p. 237; Zagoskin, *Istoriya prava*, II, Kazan', 1879, pp. 21–2.

¹⁰ Sergeyevich, *Lektsii*, pp. 257 ff.; Zagoskin, *Istoriya prava*, I, 38–9, pp. 140 ff.

¹¹ Sergeyevich, *Lektsii*, pp. 261–4; *idem*, *Russkiya yuridicheskaya drevnost*, 2nd ed., I, St Petersburg, 1902, pp. 392, 408–10.

¹² *Obzor*, p. 174.

¹³ *Lektsii*, pp. 265 ff.; for a more tempered view see his *Drevnost*, II, St Petersburg, 1900, pp. 386–7.

¹⁴ Vladimirsky-Budanov, *Obzor*, p. 174; Sergeyevich, *Lektsii*, p. 265; Zagoskin, *Istoriya prava*, I, p. 146; II, p. 24.

¹⁵ Klyuchevsky, *Boyarskaya дума*, 5th ed., Petrograd, 1919, pp. 152 ff.

¹⁶ *Obzor*, p. 176.

duke through . . . the boyar дума'. This council was 'the highest body of government and administration' which 'served as a legislative council and directed both internal and foreign affairs, as well as army administration'. Indeed, Vernadsky believed that the дума boyars became so powerful that Ivan III tried to erode some of their power by relying upon state secretaries to conduct certain affairs of the realm.¹⁷

Not only does a difference of opinion exist concerning the responsibility and function of the дума, but there is also some question about its personnel. Substantial agreement exists, however, on the changing character of дума appointments. The increasing flow of princely families from annexed or neighbouring principalities had by Ivan III's reign gradually displaced some of the older boyaral families from their privileged position in both the army and the дума.¹⁸

These themes, or their variants, are to be found embedded in the textbooks of our age. Soviet scholars, with some notable exceptions, have cast little light on the дума. Instead they have, so to speak, ridden over the problem with their hobbyhorse of socio-economic conditions and inevitable class war. While 19th- and early 20th-century scholars may be taken to task by Soviet historians for starting from a particular theoretical position and looking for substantiating evidence, the same comment applies to current Soviet studies.

Until recent years little has been done to identify the personnel of the дума; in consequence, there have been few attempts to discover the actual functions performed by individual дума members.¹⁹ This may appear an exaggeration, in view of the existence of a 17th-century text known as the 'Sheremetev list of court ranks', which contains the names of дума incumbents and their presumed dates of service.²⁰ Some historians have commented upon its unreliability,

¹⁷ G. Vernadsky, *Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age*, New Haven, Conn., 1959, pp. 117-18.

¹⁸ Solov'yov, *Istoriya Rossii*, III, Moscow, 1960, pp. 154-5, already suggested this. Klyuchevsky made this a major facet of his third phase of Russian history: *Boyarskaya дума*, pp. 203 ff.; *Kurs russkoy istorii in Sochineniya*, III, pp. 140 ff.; *idem*, *Istoriya sosloviy in Sochineniya*, VI, 381-3; see also Presnyakov, *Moskovskoye tsarstvo*, pp. 48 ff.; Sergeyevich, *Drevnosti*, II, p. 403.

¹⁹ S. B. Veselovsky did considerable research along these lines in his 'Explanatory notes to the documents', in the cooperative edition of the *Akty sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoy istorii severo-vostochnoy Rusi kontsa XIV-nachala XVI v.* (hereafter cited as *ASISR*), I, Moscow, 1952, pp. 590-637. The notes in volumes II and III, done by another hand, are not of the same quality. Yet even Veselovsky put too much trust in the chronicle identifications and upon the Sheremetev list. N. A. Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeyev i ego sochineniya*, Moscow/Leningrad, 1960, pp. 36 ff. has an interesting discussion of the careers of Prince Ivan Yur'evich Patrikeyev and his son Prince Vasily Ivanovich, both of whom were important дума members in the reign of Ivan III. There are some excellent entries under individual names in the pre-revolutionary *Russkiy biograficheskiy slovar'*, though there, too, many of the authors rely rather heavily upon chronicle citations and the Sheremetev list for boyar status.

²⁰ *Drevnyaya rossiyskaya vivliofika* (hereinafter cited as *DRV*), 2nd ed., XX, Moscow, 1791.

yet continued to cite it as evidence and to derive generalisations from it.²¹ Sergeyevich, for example, noted that 'from the middle of the 15th century we know the names of all the [council] boyars [i.e. *vedyonnyye boyare*] and we can follow each change in its composition to the very end of the 17th century'.²² He, and others who depended upon the Sheremetev list, could then say that in 1462 only five boyars sat in the дума and that by the end of Ivan III's reign the number rose to thirteen.²³ From this list derives the constantly repeated generalisation that with the reign of Ivan III members of the princely line began to supersede members of the old untitled boyar families, who dominated the council in the period prior to the mid-15th century.

This dilemma has prompted Alexander Zimin to discard completely the information contained in the Sheremetev compilation. He suspects not only that the dates of service may have been wrong, but also that some of the names of дума members were not *bona fide*. In a pioneering endeavour he has constructed a new list of members of the council between 1462 and 1483, utilising only references found in contemporary documents. Quite properly, he disregards chronicle identifications, since the term boyar could be used to identify a member of the highest non-princely social group rather than a member of the royal council.²⁴ Of the forty-nine boyars and twenty-two *okol'nichiye* (second-grade дума members) mentioned for the half-century of Ivan III's reign in the Sheremetev list, Zimin finds documentary confirmation for half (i.e. twenty-four boyars—with an additional two in question—and twelve *okol'nichiye*).²⁵ He also identifies as members of Ivan III's council eight boyars and one *okol'nichiy* not included in the Sheremetev list. Possibly some дума personnel were omitted by Zimin's method, because they did not participate in any of the activities recorded by extant documents;²⁶

²¹ Sergeyevich, *Drevnosti*, I, p. 395: 'Notwithstanding its great importance, it is not complete, conjuring up no small number of questions, which are impossible to answer even with conjectures'. N. P. Likhachev (*Razryadnyye d'yaki XVI veka*, St Petersburg, 1888, p. 107, n. 1) made virtually the same comment. Klyuchevsky (*Boyarskaya дума*, p. 217) noted that the Sheremetev list 'was not exact. Verifying it whenever possible with the aid of chronicles, *razryadnyye* and boyaral books and lists, both in published and in manuscript form, we are able to note that with the reign of Vasily [III] Ivanovich the inexactness of chronological evidence of the lists consists not so much in the incompleteness of the entries, as much as in the unreliability of chronological evidence; many of the boyars and *okol'nichiye* were raised to their ranks earlier than is indicated in the list.' Had Klyuchevsky checked the information from the Sheremetev list for the entries of the later 15th century—which, significantly, he did not—he would have had to extend the limits of his observations. Veselovsky also relied heavily on the Sheremetev list; this is evident from a close reading of his notes in *ASISR*, I, pp. 590 ff.

²² Sergeyevich, *Drevnosti*, I, p. 399.

²³ *Ibid.*, I, p. 401; Zagoskin, *Istoriya prava*, II, pp. 26–7.

²⁴ Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, pp. 44–87; for the registers of boyars and *okol'nichiye* in Ivan III's reign, see pp. 44–8.

²⁵ See Appendices I and II to this article.

²⁶ Zimin placed primary reliance upon the earliest military service register (*DRK*), monastic cartularies, judicial documents, treaties and diplomatic papers.

one may even point to at least five boyars (possibly six) and one okol'nicnyi (possibly two) he overlooks in his survey;²⁷ nevertheless, we now have a core of confirmable names.

²⁷ See Appendices I and II. The following examples will illustrate this. The name of Fyodor Vasil'yevich Basenok is conspicuously absent. His name does not appear in any of the *rodoslovnyye knigi*, presumably because he was of humble birth. He first emerged into historical light in 1446, when he defied Prince Dmitry Shemyaka, the usurper of the throne of Muscovy. After Vasily II recovered his throne in 1447, Basenok's star rose rapidly. He commanded the personal regiment (*dvor*) of the grand prince on a number of occasions and appears to have won promotion to boyar in 1452. This at least is the view reflected in some chronicles (*PSRL*, IV, p. 147; XXV Moscow/Leningrad, 1949, pp. 266, 270, 272, 274; XXVIII, Moscow/Leningrad, 1963, p. 280). Even if one would be inclined to reject the chronicle information for the identification of boyars, we know that Basenok, as a boyar, witnessed the testament of Vasily II in 1461 (*Dukhovnyye i dogovornyye gramoty velikikh i udel'nykh knyazey XIV-XVI vv.* (hereafter cited as *DDG*), ed. L. V. Cherepnin, Moscow/Leningrad, 1950, No. 61, p. 198: '[As witnesses] to the testament there sat: Trifon, archimandrite of Spasskiy, Afonasey, archimandrite of Simanovskiy, and my boyars, Prince Ivan Yur'yevich [Patrikeyev], Ivan Ivanovich, Vasily Ivanovich [Kitay Novosil'tsev], and Fyodor Vasil'yevich [Basenok]'). While Basenok undoubtedly continued in the ranks of the boyars of the new reign, despite the lack of such mention in the Sheremetev list, there are no indications of his activities after 1462 in either chronicles or documents. This, of itself, means nothing, in that the last chronicle mention of him came in 1456, yet we know that he continued in a non-military capacity at court after that. All we know of him at present was discovered by Ya. S. Lur'ye in a manuscript redaction of the Sofia chronicle: *Ideologicheskaya bor'ba v russkoy publitsistike kontsa XV—nachala XVI veka*, Moscow/Leningrad, 1960, p. 53. Basenok is blinded by order of Ivan III and incarcerated in Kirillov monastery (*ibid.*, p. 60).

Fyodor Mikhaylovich (Chelyadnin) is also missing from both the list compiled by Zimin and the Sheremetev compilation. He too continued as a boyar into the early reign of Ivan III. Chelyadnin, like Novosil'tsev, served primarily in an administrative capacity. In 1461 or early 1462 he appeared as a boyar witness to the addendum to the testament of Vasily II (*DDG*, No. 61, p. 199); the identification of Fyodor Mikhaylovich is Veselovsky's (*ASISR*, I, p. 606). Chelyadnin appears to have served as a judge for Ivan III in the opening years of the reign. See the early 15th-century document with a mid-15th-century postscript, in which 'vyslushal sud boyarine svoego Fyodora Mikhaylovicha'. The postscript, written by the grand-princely *d'yak* Aleksey Poluektov, puts the event in the early years of Ivan III's reign (*ASISR*, I, No. 20, p. 37).

The identification of the boyar Ivan Ivanovich, mentioned in the above quotation, poses some difficulty. Veselovsky (*ASISR*, I, p. 611) identified him as Buturlin. This association does not appear convincing. Ivan Ivanovich Buturlin was the father of boyar Andrey Ivanovich Buturlin, known to have sat in the *duma* as early as 1456, thereby making improbable an assumption that the elder Buturlin was still alive (see the genealogy in Likhachev, *Razryadnyye d'yaki*, p. 138, n. 2). Golubtsov has suggested that this mysterious Ivan Ivanovich was a member of the Koshkin family (*ASISR*, II, Moscow, 1958, p. 562). I. I. Koshkin was a man in his middle years in the late 1450s, as may be deduced from the fact that his first cousin (and genealogical equal), Andrey Fyodorovich Goltay, met his death at the battle of Suzdal' in 1445 (*Rodoslovnaya kniga knyazey i dvoryan Rossiyskikh i v'yezzikh*, ed. N. I. Novikov, II, Moscow, 1787, 123). This Koshkin had no sons, only two daughters, neither of whom made advantageous marriages—hardly credible had their father sat in the *duma*. There is still another Ivan Ivanovich who might be considered. He belonged to an old Muscovite serving family which had come to Moscow in the mid-14th century. According to the genealogical lists he was descended from a 'Prince' Aleksandr Vsevolodovich, who had emigrated from Smolensk. Two of this Aleksandr's sons served in the leading regiment at Kulikovo Pole in 1380; the elder of these was the grandfather of Ivan Ivanovich. This grandson Ivan reached adulthood by the 1430s, for his cousins (and genealogical equals) served in the regiments of Vasily II; one of these was killed at the bloody battle of Belev in 1437, and another in 1445 while accompanying Vasily II home after his release from Tatar captivity (*Rodoslovnaya kniga*, II, 43 ff.; *Vremennik Imperatorskago Moskovskago obshchestva istorii i drevnostey Rossiiskikh* (hereafter cited as *Vremennik*), X, Moscow, 1851, 'Materialy', p. 252). What makes this Ivan Ivanovich a prime candidate is that his brother was a boyar (*ASISR*, I, No. 277, pp. 198 and 612) and that his four daughters succeeded in finding distinguished husbands. The eldest married Prince Danilo Kholm'sky, the noted Tverian émigré. The second wed

II

Zimin has also published another study which bears in part upon the delegation of authority to duma members. This sets out to construct a list of governors (*namestniki*) assigned to the various cities and towns of Muscovy in the late 15th and 16th centuries.²⁸ Unhappily this list is far from complete, largely because the evidence for such a reconstruction is not available, but also because it has not used available source citations. Nevertheless we are again in Zimin's debt for making available this valuable information.

If the revised list of Ivan III's duma members is collated with the one containing the names of identifiable governors, several deductions emerge which call in question the validity of some accepted generalisations. The first concerns a widely held belief that the towns of Muscovy were grouped administratively according to their importance: the more important the town, the higher the rank of the governor assigned. Thus the most important towns were administered by boyars and towns of secondary or tertiary importance by *okol'nichiye* and non-duma functionaries.²⁹ A second generalisation, from the pen of Klyuchevsky, contends that boyars sent out as provincial administrators were divorced from the decision-making process in the duma. Klyuchevsky, on the strength of a single

Prince Ivan Vasil'yevich Bulgak Patrikeyev, grandson of the extraordinarily influential boyar in Vasily II's reign and nephew of the boyar Prince Ivan Yur'yevich. The third married Semyon Borisovich Bryukho Tuchko-Morozov and the last, Prince Vasily Mnikh Ryapolovsky (*Rodoslovnaya kniga*, II, p. 43; *Vremennik*, X, 'Materialy', p. 252), both closely related to influential boyaral families.

According to the Sheremetev list, Prince Pyotr Vasil'yevich Velikoy died as an *okol'nichiy* and *dvoretskiy* (royal steward) (*DRV*, XX, p. 16). See Appendix I. Presumably he was cast out of the council and lost his post in 1500/01, was reinstated in 1503/04 and died in 1512/13 as an *okol'nichiy* and *dvoretskiy*. Since Zimin did not find any documentary confirmation of Prince Pyotr's council rank, he did not include him in the list. It appears to me, however, that Prince Pyotr Vasil'yevich Velikoy Shestunov-Yaroslavsky (the identification is that of L. V. Cherepnin in *Akty feodal'nogo zemlevladieniya i khozyaystva XIV-XVI vekov* (hereafter cited as *AFZKh*), I, Moscow, 1951, p. 377) was a *dvoretskiy* at least from 1489/90 to the end of Ivan III's reign. In 1489/90 he was already performing the duties of a *dvoretskiy* (*ASISR*, I, No. 541, pp. 420-1) and Ivan III referred to him as his *dvoretskiy* in his testament, composed about 1504 (*DDG*, No. 89, p. 363). For other evidence of his activity, see *AFZKh*, I, pp. 126-7, 232-3; *ASISR*, I, pp. 490 ff., 534-5. Since the previous royal stewards of the later 15th century were always members of the council, it seems reasonable to assume that Prince Pyotr was also admitted, by virtue of his documented position.

If Zimin's list is incomplete with regard to duma personnel, it is equally inexact about some dates of promotion. The above example of Vasily Ivanovich Novosil'tsev, boyar at least since 1461, is a case in point. Zimin ('Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 45) finds the first mention of him as a boyar in 1475. Further research should amplify our knowledge of the composition of the duma in the later 15th century.

²⁸ Zimin, 'Spisok namestnikov Russkogo gosudarstve pervoy poloviny XVI v.', *Arkheograficheskiy yezhegodnik za 1960* (hereafter cited as *AE* 1960), Moscow, 1962, pp. 27-42.

²⁹ *Famyatniki diplomaticheskikh snosheniy drevney Rossii s derzhavami inostrannymi* (hereafter cited as *PDS*), I, St Petersburg, 1851. The editor states (p. xxi): '... goroda razdelialis' na razlichnyye stepeni; namestnikami boleye vazhnykh gorodov imenovalis' boyare, a drugikh meneye vazhnykh okol'nichiye, i t.d. po chinam. . .'

illustration, even held that some boyars merely preserved honorific court rank while they occupied provincial governorship.³⁰

Comparing the information to be derived from Zimin's two lists, one is impressed with the lack of substance in these generalisations, at least for the latter part of the 15th century.³¹ Boyars and okol'-nichiye did not win assignments to governorships of towns or districts of the realm on any regular or rotational basis. Nor did Ivan III

³⁰ Klyuchevsky, *Boyarskaya дума*, pp. 157-8: 'Another foreigner from Lithuania, Pan Sudimont, appears as a *boyarin vvedyonnyy* [i.e. a boyar of the council] of Ivan III and namestnik of Kostroma, then in Vladimir, so that it is possible to say of him: "he was a *boyarin vvedenny* and provincial administrator, but beyond that he held Kostroma and Vladimir by princely grant." Thus provincial administrators retained court rank; on the other hand, boyars who participated at court sometimes carried the rank of provincial rulers. It is known that Muscovite council people in the 15th and 16th centuries were identified in the diplomatic papers as namestniki of Moscow, Novgorod, Kolomna, etc. Seemingly, these ranks were already honorary titles in the reign of Ivan III. From the letter of Ivan III to Pan Sudimont it is seen that sometimes this namestnik, governing Kostroma, arrived in Moscow; probably he appeared there as a boyar.' Klyuchevsky later added (*ibid.*, pp. 158-9) that Ivan forbade Sudimont to appear in Moscow without permission. 'Afterwards the boyars administering provinces sometimes preserved court dignity ranks, but did not appear in the дума, and sat in their provincial *kormleniya*'.

Unfortunately Klyuchevsky relied upon a most unfortunate text for his illustration and then drew conclusions exceeding the bounds permitted by his evidence. The document he chose came to light only as a result of a conflict over social precedence in church between the two namestniki of Kostroma, Pan Ivan Sudimont Kondrat'yevich and Yakov Zakhar'yevich Koshkin and their wives. The date of the altercation is not known. I suspect that this document, dated by the editor 'around 1499' (*Akty istoricheskiye, sobrannyye i izdannyye Arkheograficheskoyu Kommissiiyu*, I, St Petersburg, 1841, No. 110, p. 164) really should be dated perhaps as early as 1469 and no later than 1479. As a result of the altercation between Ivan Sudimont and Koshkin, Ivan III transferred Koshkin to Vladimir as a second namestnik to serve under Prince Danilo Kholm'sky. Neither Kholm'sky nor Koshkin are called boyars, in contrast to Ivan Sudimont, who is called 'vvedyonnyy boyarin'. I suspect that neither of the Vladimir namestniki were as yet boyars. Prince Kholm'sky served as a general in the Kazan' campaign in 1469 (see below, n. 147) and Vladimir may have been the springboard for his force's offensive. Every indication we have of boyars being assigned to posts as namestniki shows that this was to perform specific tasks. Ivan III did not usually farm out his boyars to keep them out of Moscow or to break their contact with the дума. Furthermore, though namestniki, when two were assigned to a given jurisdiction, were accorded equal social honours, only one could be of senior дума rank. A. P. Pronshteyn has noted (*Velikiy Novgorod v XVI veke*, Kharkov, 1957, pp. 204-5) that the two namestniki assigned to Novgorod were accorded equal privileges: 'From the moment of the union with Moscow, in Novgorod there resided simultaneously two namestniki, possessing equal rights and position. Data which support an equal position of both namestniki of Novgorod can be voluminously provided. When, for example, the archbishop of Novgorod was host at a banquet on 25 March 1548 for the namestniki Prince Ivan Mikhaylovich Shuysky and Prince Yuri Mikhaylovich Bulgakov, he showed them honour in equal degree and presented them with gifts of identical value. Unfortunately, Pronshteyn did not compare the ranks of the individuals sent to Novgorod in the last quarter of the 15th century, or even in the 16th century. (Even in 1548 Prince Yuri Bulgakov was a boyar; Prince Ivan Shuysky did not obtain this rank until some time later.) He might have noted that the senior was always a boyar and the junior namestnik usually of non-дума rank. This question will be examined later in the present article. But the social equality exemplified by the treatment accorded to the governors in this instance is also reflected in the quarrel between Sudimont and Yakov Koshkin in the document cited by Klyuchevsky.

Returning to Klyuchevsky's comments, it is only an assumption, at least in this period, that provincial governors retained дума rank as an honorary title or that court personnel received titles of namestniki without actually serving as such. Time and again such unwarranted conclusions have been accepted as valid generalisations and have so entered the mainstream of historical studies.

³¹ 'Sostav', *AE* 1957; 'Spisok namestnikov', *AE* 1960.

send out these valued servitors to be rid of them at court, or as a means of permitting them to recoup their fortunes. If *duma* members did receive such administrative assignments—and the occasions were rare rather than common—it was only to fulfil specific instructions implementing grand-princely policy. In most instances such assignments were tied to defence or military activity; in unusual circumstances, as in Novgorod the Great in the early 1490s, administrative reorganisation called for the presence of an experienced *okol'nichiy*.³² Apparently there is only one major exception to this general policy. After the definitive annexation of Novgorod in 1478, Ivan III appointed a council boyar as senior viceroy in that western province.³³

These observations require illustration.

Ivan Vasil'yevich Shchadra Vel'yaminov, a member of an ancient Muscovite serving family, is first mentioned in the chronicles in 1491, when Ivan III sent him to Uglich to administer the confiscated lands of his brother, Prince Andrey the Elder.³⁴ At the time of his appointment Ivan Shchadra was only a medium-ranking servitor attached to the court. He may have served for some time prior to this, although not in a position that brought him to the attention of the chroniclers. From mid-1495 to 1503 he served as governor in Vyaz'ma, a territory recently wrested from Lithuania. In the second Muscovite-Lithuanian war (1500–1503), while still governor, he also served as a regimental officer in a striking force that stormed Dorogobuzh.³⁵ Since the newly annexed territory was contiguous with the area already under his administration, Ivan III extended his jurisdiction as governor over Dorogobuzh. He held this dual position between 1503 and 1505. At the same time Ivan III promoted Ivan Shchadra to the *duma* rank of *okol'nichiy* (1503) and allowed him to remain military governor.³⁶

We may draw several tentative conclusions from this information. Ivan Shchadra had been governor of Uglich, an important interior town, while still a medium-ranking court functionary. Until late in his career he apparently ascended the ladder of the civil administration, as may be inferred from the absence of his name from the military register. Subsequently, when renewal of war with Lithuania was

³² Pyotr Mikhaylovich Pleshcheyev, an *okol'nichiy*, was assigned as junior boyar to Novgorod from 1490 to 1495 (see Appendix III). The senior viceroy in the decade from 1485 to 1495 was the trusted boyar Yakov Zakhar'yevich Koshkin.

³³ See Appendix III.

³⁴ *PSRL*, XXVII, Moscow/Leningrad, 1962, p. 362.

³⁵ Zimin, 'Spisok namestnikov', *AE* 1960, p. 29. Ivan Shchadra became senior namestnik in 1503, with his headquarters in Vyaz'ma, while Prince Fyodor Yur'yevich Prozorovsky, an elderly junior boyar, became the subsidiary namestnik in Dorogobuzh (*ibid.*, p. 30). For Ivan Shchadra's participation in the military campaign, see *DRK*, p. 26; *PSRL*, XXIII, St Petersburg, 1910, p. 196; for the general developments, see J. L. I. Fennell, *Ivan the Great of Moscow*, Cambridge, 1961, pp. 221 ff.

³⁶ Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 48, n. 83.

imminent, he was given a particularly sensitive frontier post in the west. Though we cannot tell from the meagre source entries, he was most probably charged with keeping the territory loyal to Moscow. He also assumed responsibility for maintaining local defences and for leading local contingents in time of war. Presumably Ivan III promoted Ivan Shchadra to the rank of okol'nichiy only in small part for his successes in his last position. Entry to the *duma* during this reign (as will be shown below) was never won for a single action; one may conclude that Ivan Schadra had successfully passed a series of tests over a long time, wherein he gave evidence of his fidelity, accomplishment and ability.

Let us now turn to several instances where boyars received appointments as governors. Prince Semyon Ivanovich Ryapolovsky served as governor of the important eastern town of Suzdal' towards the end of the 15th century, after his entry into the *duma* as a boyar.³⁷ His governorship was connected with military ventures, the precise nature of which is not certain. In the Kazan' campaigns of 1478 and 1487 he was one of the leading military commanders.³⁸ Between 1497 and 1499, the time of his execution for some still unidentified crime, he is repeatedly mentioned as a general on the Kazan' frontier.³⁹ Relations with the khanate had taken a turn for the worse. The present writer suspects that Ryapolovsky was governor and general assigned to Suzdal' on at least one, or perhaps several, of these occasions. Boyars did receive assignments as military governors of districts when major campaigns were in the offing. As was the case with Ivan Shchadra Vel'yaminov in Vyaz'ma, Ryapolovsky's responsibilities in Suzdal' were to assemble the regional forces in preparation for an offensive and to ensure adequate defence measures. Since Suzdal' was a major pivot for river and road movement against Kazan', the assignment of a boyar as governor becomes understandable.

Special circumstances of a military or non-military nature occasionally called for the assignment of an influential boyar to the

³⁷ According to Zimin ('Spisok namestnikov', *AE* 1960, p. 40), 'Prince Semyon Ivanovich' served as namestnik in Suzdal' 'at the end of the fifteenth century'. Unfortunately his source (*SIRIO*, LIX, p. 549) did not allow a more precise dating. Since Prince Semyon was deposed as a boyar and executed in 1499, his service in Suzdal' took place before that date (*PSRL*, VI, p. 243; XXIII, p. 196). The first documentary mention of Prince Semyon as a boyar dates from 1495 (*DRK*, p. 19), but the Sheremetev list claims that he reached the rank in 1477/78 (*DRV*, XX, p. 4). Though Zimin ('Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 46) prefers the 1495 date, I am inclined to accept the information found in the Sheremetev list. In 1477 Prince Semyon participated as a general in the Great Regiment in the Novgorodian campaign (*DRK*, p. 12). Given the size of the force, the leadership of the most important regiment must have gone to boyars. Moreover, in the following year he and Vasily Fyodorovich Obrazets, who had been boyar at least since 1475 (*DRK*, p. 11), were joint commanders of a large striking force against Kazan' (*PSRL*, XXIII, p. 162).

³⁸ *PSRL*, XXIII, p. 178; XXVIII, p. 287.

³⁹ *DRK*, pp. 23-4.

office of namestnik. Vasily Fyodorovich Obrazets, grandson of Constantine Ivanovich Dobrynsky (a rich and influential personage in the reign of Vasily II),⁴⁰ was one of the more trusted boyar confidants of Ivan III. He became a boyar in the early 1470s, certainly no later than 1475.⁴¹ On a number of occasions Obrazets served as namestnik in various towns, but in each instance his service was tied to a specific grand-princely venture. In 1477 he became governor in Torzhok on the eve of the Novgorodian campaign.⁴² Torzhok was a key centre of communications and a troop assembly-point. Subsequently he led the Great Regiment of one of the army wings attacking Novgorod.⁴³ In 1479 Ivan III named Obrazets as his namestnik in Borovsk, with orders to apprehend secretly Prince Ivan Lyko Obolensky. Obolensky had defected to the service of one of Ivan III's brothers rather than face charges brought against him by the inhabitants of a Novgorodian frontier town for alleged violation of their rights during his tenure there as namestnik. Obrazets successfully carried out his mission.⁴⁴ Finally, after the conquest of Tver' in 1485, Ivan III assigned Obrazets as his governor of the conquered capital.⁴⁵ In each instance Ivan III used this trusted and responsible boyar to carry out a mission of importance.

Assignments to governorships normally went to middle-ranking men of service, except when circumstances required the presence of a council member. In his list of namestniki for Ustyug in the last quarter of the 15th century, Zimin identified as governors Pyotr Fyodorovich Chelyadnin in 1477/78; Prince Ivan Ivanovich Zloba (Zvenets?) in 1488; and Fyodor Krasnyy 'at the end of the 15th century'.⁴⁶

Pyotr Chelyadnin was a fifth-generation descendant of the famous Akinf Gavrilovich⁴⁷ and thus a member of an old Muscovite serving family. Pyotr's father had been a boyar in the later reign of Vasily II⁴⁸ and his brother Andrey Fyodorovich attained boyar rank by 1495/96;⁴⁹ Pyotr himself became a boyar at least as early as 1475.⁵⁰

⁴⁰ S. B. Veselovsky, *Feodal'noye zemlevladieniye v severo-vostochnoy Rusi*, I, Moscow/Lenin-grad, 1947, pp. 148–9.

⁴¹ According to *DRV*, XX, p. 4, he became a boyar in 1473/74; the first documentary evidence is for 1475 (Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 45, n. 33).

⁴² *Iosafovskaya letopis'*, p. 98.

⁴³ *DRK*, p. 12; *PSRL*, VI, p. 207.

⁴⁴ *PSRL*, VI, p. 222.

⁴⁵ *PSRL*, XV, St Petersburg, 1863, col. 500.

⁴⁶ Zimin, 'Spisok namestnikov', *AE* 1960, p. 40.

⁴⁷ *Vremennik*, X, 'Materialy', pp. 102, 104.

⁴⁸ *ASISR*, I, No. 277, p. 198; *DDG*, No. 61, p. 199.

⁴⁹ *DRK*, p. 19; *DRV*, XX, p. 8.

⁵⁰ *DRK*, p. 11, where he is identified only as 'Pyotr Fyodorovich'. Zimin ('Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 45) erroneously identifies him as Pyotr Fyodorovich Khromoy. Indeed, Fyodor Davydovich Khromoy had a son named Peter, but Zimin himself identified this Peter as only reaching the rank of okol'nichiy in about 1501 (*ibid.*, p. 48).

Possibly he attained this rank even earlier, for in 1472 he commanded the grand prince's regiment at Aleksin at the time of the Tatar invasion.⁵¹ This was an extraordinary occasion. Pyotr Fyodorovich apparently spent most of his time at court. He was one of the boyars selected to accompany Ivan III on his state visits to Novgorod in 1475 and 1479,⁵² but in the final campaign against the republic Ivan gave him the governorship of Ustyug, rather far from the western theatre of war.⁵³ Though the chronicler of Ustyug is unclear in his account of the events of the year 1477/78, the hostility of the Kazan' khan accounted for the presence of a boyar as military governor of that isolated north-eastern frontier town. Fear of an imminent attack compelled the citizens to remain inside the fort. Only the spring floods prevented the approach of a Tatar force. Apparently advised of the inadequate defences of the old town by his boyar namestnik, Ivan III commanded him to raze the old fortifications and to replace them with a new set of walls.⁵⁴

Ivan Ivanovich Zloba, hesitatingly and erroneously identified by Zimin as Prince Ivan Zvenets-Zvenigorodsky, does not appear in the published genealogies. There is no doubt, however, that this unknown Zloba was namestnik of Ustyug in 1488/89, for in the campaign against Vyatka of 1489 he is mentioned as a participant. According to the military register, in the boat force were 'voyevoda Ivan Ivanovich Soltyk Travin and Prince Ivan Semyonovich Kubenskoy, and Yury Ivanovich Shestak, and the namestnik of Ustyug Ivan Ivanovich Zloba, and Prince Ivan Ivanovich Zvenets; and Zloba did not survive but died and they then took Vyatka'.⁵⁵ Zloba and Zvenets were obviously two different people; the former was not of princely stock.

The account in the Ustyug chronicle does cause some initial confusion. With an unusual eye for detail, the chronicler identified the contingent commanders on the Vyatka campaign: 'The Tverian vovody were Andrey Korobov and Prince Osip Dorogobuzhskoy; and of the Ustyuzhane, Prince Ivan Ivanovich Zvenets; and of the Dvinyane, Prince Ivan Lyko, and of the Vashane and Kargopol'tsy, Yury Ivanovich Shostak'.⁵⁶ At first sight it might be assumed that Prince Ivan Zvenets, as commander of the forces of Ustyug, was also the namestnik, though the chronicler carefully refrained from saying so. It should be explained that the government of Ivan III relied

⁵¹ *PSRL*, IV, p. 151; XXIII, p. 160.

⁵² *DRK*, pp. 11, 13.

⁵³ See the lists of command for 1477/78 in *DRK*, pp. 12-13.

⁵⁴ *Ustyuzhskiy letopisnyy svod*, Moscow/Leningrad, 1950, p. 92; see also the short biography by B. Beneshevich, 'Chelyadnin, Pyotr Fedorovich', *Russkiy biograficheskiy slovar'*, St Petersburg, 1905, p. 138.

⁵⁵ *DRK*, p. 15.

⁵⁶ *Ustyuzhskiy letopisnyy svod*, p. 97.

upon a practice whereby selected members of the grand-princely regiment (the *dvor*) received assignments to organise and lead regional contingents when a major campaign was in the offing. Only the forces of Pskov and Novgorod the Great were exempted from this practice, largely because veteran commanders invariably received those assignments. Thus on this major campaign against Vyatka, commanded by the boyar Prince Danilo Shchenya, Yury Shestak and Prince Ivan Lyko Obolensky (rehabilitated after his disgrace of 1479) are immediately identifiable as junior boyars of the court guard.⁵⁷ So too is Prince Ivan Zvenets. Zvenets was first mentioned in the chronicles in 1468 as the military commander of the Ustyug contingent in the Kazan' campaign.⁵⁸ In 1475 he was a junior boyar at court.⁵⁹ Immediately after the successful Vyatka campaign of 1489, this servitor of more than twenty years' service became an *okol'nichiy* (1490).⁶⁰

Fyodor Krasnyy, like Zloba, is not identifiable from such a vague description ('Fyodor the Handsome'). It is certain, however, that he was not a member of the *duma*.

An examination of the persons assigned as *namestniki* to the key town of Nizhniy Novgorod will demonstrate further the general lack of correlation between the ranks of governors and the importance of the towns assigned to their keeping. Since Nizhniy Novgorod lay at the confluence of the Oka and Volga rivers, on the frontier of the Kazan' khanate, its significance as a trading, communications and defence centre cannot be questioned.

Zimin identified Dmitry Vasil'yevich Bobr as *namestnik* there 'at the end of the 15th century'.⁶¹ From information currently available we cannot tell whether Ivan III employed dual *namestniki* in Nizhniy Novgorod as he did in Novgorod the Great. Dmitry Bobr served neither in the *duma* nor in any important army command. Much earlier, in 1446, he had been a junior boyar, one among many who joined in the conspiracy to win Vasily II his freedom and return him to the throne of his forefathers.⁶² Thereafter his name disappears from the pages of the chronicles and from the documents pertaining to court activities. He did purchase a village in Dmitrov uyezd.⁶³ His elder brother, Ivan Vasil'yevich Oshchera, had become an

⁵⁷ See *DRK*, p. 11 for Shestak and pp. 17, 18 for Prince Ivan Lyko Obolensky. A considerable number of the members of the grand princely regiment and the court branch of the *dvor* accompanied Ivan III to Novgorod in 1495; fortunately their names are listed in the military register (*ibid.*, pp. 20–22).

⁵⁸ *PSRL*, VI, p. 188; VIII, St Petersburg, 1859, p. 153.

⁵⁹ *PSRL*, VI, p. 203; *DRK*, p. 11.

⁶⁰ Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 47 and n. 63.

⁶¹ 'Spisok *namestnikov*', *AE* 1960, p. 32.

⁶² *PSRL*, XXV, Moscow/Leningrad, 1949, p. 267; Veselovsky, *ASISR*, I, p. 616.

⁶³ *ASISR*, I, No. 389, p. 283.

okol'nichiy by the 1470s.⁶⁴ Possibly it was through his influence that Dmitry Bobr attained the temporary but lucrative post of governor of Nizhniy Novgorod.

In 1491 this post was held by one Ivan Vasil'yevich.⁶⁵ This seems to have been Ivan Vasil'yevich Chebot, descended from an old Muscovite boyaral family, the Sviblovs, with a record of distinguished service to the early rulers of Muscovy. He attained the rank of okol'nichiy by 1490⁶⁶ and served almost exclusively at court in capacities as yet undiscovered.⁶⁷ It should be noted that 1491 was a year of peace with Kazan' and that Ivan III was then mobilising his army, including the regiments of the now friendly Kazan' khanate, to aid his ally, the khan of the Crimea. This would explain why a civilian rather than a warrior should be assigned to a sensitive military vantage point.⁶⁸

Prince Fyodor Khovansky was namestnik in the eastern frontier town of Murom in 1489.⁶⁹ A descendant of the Lithuanian ruler Gedimin, he belonged to the Patrikeyev branch of the family.⁷⁰ When he or his father first came to Muscovy is uncertain. Apart from this office Prince Fyodor never attained any significant position. Perhaps in disappointment, the Khovanskys transferred their allegiance to the appanage princes of the Moscow house. Fyodor's son, Prince Andrey Fyodorovich Khovansky, served in the *udely* of Volok and Uglich in the subsequent reign of Vasily III.⁷¹

These illustrations indicate the value to be derived from a comparison of the known membership of the *duma* and the governors selected for the major towns of the realm. Further systematic inquiry may lead to a reevaluation of the system whereby certain persons were assigned to provincial posts in the second half of the 15th century. Sweeping generalisations based upon single illustrations are insufficient. A better way of assessing the rôle played by the *duma*, given the relative absence of contemporary commentaries, would be to discover the functions assigned to its members. This necessitates first the identification of the *duma*'s personnel, and for this we must depend heavily upon Zimin's research—which still needs to be com-

⁶⁴ *Vremennik*, X, 'Materialy', p. 122; *DRK*, pp. 11, 13.

⁶⁵ Zimin, 'Spisok namestnikov', *AE* 1960, p. 32.

⁶⁶ *PDS*, I, cols. 26–7.

⁶⁷ This can be deduced from the fact that his name is not found in the military service register and that he had occasion and opportunity to become a close friend of Prince Vasily Danilovich Kholmsky, in that he was a distinguished participant at the latter's wedding party in the Kremlin in 1500 (*DRK*, p. 9).

⁶⁸ *PSRL*, XXVIII, p. 290.

⁶⁹ Zimin, 'Spisok namestnikov', *AE* 1960, p. 32.

⁷⁰ *Vremennik*, X, 'Materialy', p. 225.

⁷¹ Zimin, 'Knyazheskiye dukhovnyye gramoty nachala XVI v.', *Istoricheskiye zapiski*, XXVII, 1948, p. 279.

pleted.⁷² After identification it is necessary to ascertain, as best we can from the meagre evidence, the responsibilities assigned to these individuals.

III

Identity, duties assigned, and the дума's effect upon decision-making—these are vital enough questions; yet it may also be possible to learn more of the politics of the time by inquiring into the methods employed to win membership in the small exclusive club that was the дума. The effects of family connection and marital ties upon political influence have hardly been touched upon. Why, for example, when a son managed to follow his father into the дума, was that son not always the eldest?⁷³ Where members of families previously excluded from it did finally break into the charmed inner ring, what leverage did they employ? Why should the scion of one favoured family be preferred over that of another? Why should members of some old boyaral families continue to enjoy promotion to the highest positions, while others found themselves relegated to second rank or to displacement? What rôle did competition play, and what were the rewards for ability, success and loyalty? One needs to consider whether the great achievements of Ivan III's foreign

⁷² Zimin ('Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 44) himself has suggested the difficulty of reconstructing the дума membership in Ivan III's reign: 'It is not possible to ascertain accurately the composition of the boyar дума, and even less so the changes in its composition at the end of the 15th century, in view of the paucity of materials'.

⁷³ For example, the distinguished, powerful and rich Patrikeyev family might be taken to illustrate the point. Yury Patrikeyevich had married the sister of Vasily I early in the 14th century. In consequence he soon became one of the leading Muscovite boyars and remained important to the middle of the 15th century. According to the genealogical lists, Yury had two sons, Vasily and Ivan (*PSRL*, VII, St Petersburg, 1856, 254–5; *Vremennik*, X, Materialy, p. 225). The second son became the all-powerful namesnik in Ivan III's reign, though he, as did so many others in the time of civil wars, won early promotion to boyar from an appreciative Vasily II. His elder brother, who sired the senior line of Patrikeyevs, does not appear to have become a дума member, although his two sons, Princes Ivan Bulgak and Danilo Shchenya, eventually became boyars. Ivan Yur'yevich had three sons: Mikhaylo Kolushka, Vasily Kosoy (later the monk Vassian) and Ivan Myndyna. Of these only the second, Vasily Kosoy, reached boyar rank. We know that Mikhaylo Kolushka served as a junior boyar, for he so appears in the retinue of Ivan III in 1475 (*DRK*, p. 11). Some time between 1475 and 1499 he died or was killed, but the youngest son survived (*DDG*, No. 87, pp. 345–9). There is no record of his services, yet we are informed that when Ivan III ordered the arrest of Prince Ivan Yur'yevich in 1499, he also included his children (i.e. Vasily Kosoy and Ivan Myndyna) in his instructions (*PSRL*, XXIII, p. 196; XXVIII, p. 331).

Another pertinent illustration is that of the Muscovite branch of the Kholm'sky family. Prince Danilo Kholm'sky became a boyar in the mid-1470s. He had two sons, Princes Semyon and Vasily (*Vremennik*, X, 'Materialy', p. 51). Veselovsky (*Selo i derevnya v severo-vostochnoy Rusi XIV–XVI vv.*, Moscow/Leningrad, 1931, p. 72), following the information of the Sheremetev list (*DRV*, XX, p. 7), stated that the elder son, Semyon, attained boyar rank in 1494/5. Yet in the latter part of 1495 Prince Semyon is listed in the ranks of the junior boyars in the retinue of Ivan III (*DRK*, p. 24). There is no documentary evidence to support the claim of the Sheremetev list. On the other hand, the second-born son, Prince Vasily, who married a daughter of Ivan III in February 1500 (*DRK*, p. 9), probably became a boyar immediately afterwards, although the first documentary confirmation of this dates from mid-1504 (Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 48).

and domestic policies, both in formulation and in execution, can be tied to the functioning of the duma.

A modicum of testimony by a contemporary, Ivan Bersen' Beklemishev, a fairly low-ranking but highly regarded diplomat at the court of Ivan III in the last thirteen years of his reign,⁷⁴ indicates that he respected the advice given by his councillors.⁷⁵ In one instance he refused to give audience to an imperial Austrian envoy without having his boyars present.⁷⁶

In the 1570s Prince Andrey Kurbsky, a former boyar of the council of Ivan IV, then living in Lithuanian sanctuary, looked back to the time when councillors were respected and their advice played a part in the formulation of Muscovite policy:

It is hardly worth mentioning him who is still on the lips of everyone there [in Russia], namely the grandfather of the tsar, Grand Prince Ioann [Ivan], who increased his frontiers to such an extent, and, still more wondrous, drove out the khan of the Great Horde in whose bondage he had been, and destroyed his *yurt*, not because of bloodthirstiness and love of plunder, no, but in truth, because he took frequent counsel with his wise and bold advisers; for they say that he greatly loved counsel and ventured on nothing without much profound counsel.⁷⁷

Both Ivan Bersen' Beklemishev and Prince Kurbsky railed against the grand princes in the light of personal wrongs done to them; the one against Vasily III, the other against Ivan the Terrible. They sensed but did not fully articulate the essential differences in conditions that existed between the 15th and 16th centuries, between the temper and character of an Ivan III and the traits of his successors. In the latter part of the 15th century Ivan III and his advisors endeavoured to win the allegiance of the warrior class in areas recently annexed or in those marked for conquest. Emoluments and rewards had to be dangled before them. At the same time the Muscovite men of service, whose rights as free servitors had suffered considerable restriction, had to be assured that their positions would not be endangered. Inevitably, conflicts arose between titled immigrants and members of the old service groups, which sometimes assumed a political form.

⁷⁴ *DRK*, p. 21; *SIRIO*, XXXV, pp. 60, 68, 74, 82, 108, 117–36, 495; XLI, pp. 433–44, 452, 453–65, 471, 477, 481, 483, 488, 526, 537, 541.

⁷⁵ According to Ivan Nikitich Bersen' Beklemishev, Ivan III encouraged contrary opinions, even rewarding those who differed from him. Sergeyevich, *Lektsii*, p. 265; Klyuchevsky, *Kurs russkoy istorii in Sochineniya*, II, p. 162.

⁷⁶ When the imperial envoy, Nicholas Poppel, came to Moscow in 1489 on his second visit, he requested a private audience with the grand prince. Ivan III initially replied that he would not meet the envoy unless his boyars were present (*PDS*, I, col. 6). Present at the subsequent interview were Prince Ivan Yur'yevich Patrikeyev, Prince Danilo Shchenya, and Yakov Zakhar'yevich Koshkin, who was then namestnik in Novgorod (Pronshteyn, *Velikiy Novgorod*, p. 260; cf. V. N. Bernadsky, *Novgorod i novgorodskaya zemlya v XV veke*, Moscow/Leningrad, 1961, p. 332).

⁷⁷ *Kurbsky's History of Ivan IV*, ed. and trans. J. L. I. Fennell, Cambridge, 1965, p. 89.

The delicate problems involved in stemming these conflicts demanded, and quite possibly received, a good deal of discussion in the duma.

The problems of the 16th century were quite different. Immigration of foreign orthodox warriors diminished with the lack of military success against Lithuania. Increasingly the rulers of Muscovy found it expedient to spurn the voluntary cooperation of the military magnates, as they began to fashion coercive weapons to enforce their participation. The growth of the *pomeshchik* group as a dependent and obedient fighting organisation; the annexation of surrounding orthodox principalities; the broader definition of treason, ending the right of free departure; the growth of an impersonal relationship between the ruler and his military following; and finally the increasing tendency to rule by decree—all these factors contributed to the arbitrariness condemned by Beklemishev and Kurbsky.

In temperament and manner of action Ivan III also differed sharply from his son and grandson. How much this difference may be attributed to acceptance of the advice of his council, we cannot tell; but he appears to have been cautious, calculating and deliberate. He manœuvred his adversaries into positions where they felt compelled to act, so making it appear that he was reacting in defence of formulated treaties or of custom, or even to protect the faith. A self-styled upholder of past traditions, he interpreted custom and history to benefit the monarchy, to transform the present to his advantage. Neither of his two immediate successors displayed the patience, craftiness, or even the occasional willingness to forgive, of Ivan III.

Sigismund von Herberstein, Habsburg ambassador to the court of Vasily III in the early years of the 16th century, commented on the powers of the Muscovite prince as compared to those of sovereigns in the Latin west:

In the control which he exercises over his people, he easily surpasses all the rulers of the entire world. That which his father began, he himself carried out: without exception, he forces all the princes and others out of all forts and fortified places. He certainly permits no citadels to belong to his brothers, nor entrusts any to them. He obliges all people to do hard service, to such an extent that whomever he orders to be with him at court, or to go to war, or to go on any mission is forced to do so at his own expense.⁷⁸

It would appear that Vasily III relied more upon favourites and state secretaries, and commensurately less upon his council.⁷⁹ And Ivan IV asserted that Russian autocracy was an inheritance from his fore-

⁷⁸ *Commentaries on Muscovite Affairs by Sigismund, Freiherr von Herberstein, Nyberg and Guttenhag*, ed. and trans. Oswald P. Backus III, Lawrence, Kansas, 1956, p. 16.

⁷⁹ Solov'yov, *Istoriya Rossii*, III, p. 299.

fathers: 'But as for the Russian autocracy, they themselves [the autocrats] from the beginning have ruled the[ir] dominions and not the boyars and not the grandes'.⁸⁰

While more influential, the members of Ivan III's *duma* nonetheless owed their positions to the continued confidence of the grand prince, much as did their successors. Once admitted to the *duma*, members served for life, although always subject to the ruler's pleasure. Periodic expulsions acted as a forcible reminder where supreme power resided.⁸¹

Prince Ivan Yur'yevich Patrikeyev was the most important boyar in Ivan III's reign. His father, Prince Yury Patrikeyevich, descended from the royal Lithuanian house of Gedimin, came to serve in Moscow early in the 15th century. There he married the sister of Vasily I and immediately became a boyar. In the divisive civil wars of the reign of Vasily II, Prince Yury remained steadfastly loyal until his death in the 1440s.⁸² His second son Ivan is first mentioned as a military commander in 1455⁸³ and as a boyar by 1461/62.⁸⁴ If we accept that he entered the *duma* in the year 1462, Prince Ivan remained a boyar for thirty-seven years. Later he, like his father before him, became military governor of Moscow and chairman of the *duma*. Foreign governments recognised the rôle played by Prince Ivan. The expense account of a representative from Reval' lists a gift for him upon arrival in Moscow.⁸⁵ When the Lithuanian magnates sought to persuade Ivan III to reduce frontier incidents or to end war, they addressed letters specifically to Prince Ivan Patrikeyev, who non-committally replied in the name of 'We and our brethren, the rada [i.e. *duma*] of our sovereign'.⁸⁶ When an immigrant general, whose loyalty was called in question, had to swear never to leave Muscovite service, the quasi-religious ceremony and the deposit of a bond by his friends took place before Prince Ivan, who then affixed his seal to the document.⁸⁷ So powerful was this first boyar of the realm that when Ivan III's brother, Andrey the

⁸⁰ *The Correspondence Between Prince A. M. Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia, 1564-1579*, ed. and trans. J. L. I. Fennell, Cambridge, 1955, pp. 13, 15.

⁸¹ Lur'ye, *Ideologicheskaya bor'ba*, p. 53. The case of the disgrace of the boyar V. F. Obrazets, suggested by Zimin ('Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 47) stems from the misinterpretation of a source. Both the enumeration of disgraces and the reasons given for them are in need of a thorough reexamination.

⁸² Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeyev*, p. 37; *PSRL*, VII, 254-5; XXVIII, pp. 104, 107, 110.

⁸³ *PSRL*, VIII, p. 144.

⁸⁴ *DDG*, No. 61, pp. 198-9.

⁸⁵ *Liv-, est- und kurländisches Urkundenbuch*, Series II, Vol. I, Riga/Moscow, 1900, No. 31, pp. 21-2.

⁸⁶ *SIRIO*, XXXV, St Petersburg, 1882, No. 22, pp. 105, 107-8. This practice continued well into the 16th century: so S. O. Shmidt, 'K istorii Tsarskago arkhiva', *Trudy Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo istoriko-arkhivnogo instituta*, XI, Moscow, 1958, pp. 384-5.

⁸⁷ *Sobraniye gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov, khranyashchikhsya v gosudarstvennoy kollegii inostrannykh del* (hereafter cited as *SGGD*), I, Moscow, 1813, No. 103, pp. 249-50.

Elder, heard a rumour in 1488 that he was about to be arrested, he appealed to Prince Ivan Patrikeyev to determine the truth of the matter, but the latter prudently refused.⁸⁸ From the early years of Ivan III's reign he appears as one of the boyars who gave advice to the grand prince in judicial appeals.⁸⁹ Between 1495 and 1499 Prince Ivan Yur'yevich and his son Prince Vasily Ivanovich were charged with collecting the reports of such cases and carrying out the grand-princely judgments pertaining to them.⁹⁰

By the time Prince Ivan Patrikeyev was deposed as a boyar in 1499, charitably forced into monk's garb rather than suffer the penalty of execution, he had accumulated riches far greater than those of any other boyar or even a junior prince of the house of Moscow.⁹¹ As the reason for Ivan III's severe judgement against his ally in the great council is not to be found in the sources, theories abound. His influence, and possibly his political involvements, had reached a level which made him dangerous to the monarchy's interests. With a severity that Kurbsky would associate with Vasily III or Ivan IV, Ivan III ensured the collapse of the Patrikeyevs by incarcerating Prince Ivan and his sons. Unable to marry and lacking heirs, this branch of the house of Gedimin became extinct in the next generation.⁹²

In view of the available evidence it would be dangerous to attempt a ranking of the remaining members of the duma in descending order of importance. Nor is this possible on the basis of which councillors remained at court and which received assignments away from Moscow. In fact, it would appear that all the council members spent most of their time in the capital. The most sedentary were the treasurer (*kaznachey*) and the state steward (*dvoretskiy*).⁹³ The chair-

⁸⁸ *PSRL*, VIII, p. 217. For speculation about this affair see Fennell, *Ivan the Great*, p. 302.

⁸⁹ *ASISR*, I, Nos. 330 (p. 240), 430 (p. 320).

⁹⁰ See L. V. Cherepnin, *Russkiye feodal'nyye arkhivy XIV-XV vekov*, II, Moscow, 1951, pp. 306-8.

⁹¹ Compare the holdings described in his testament (*DDG*, No. 86, pp. 345-9) with those of other boyars, such as Andrey Mikhaylovich Pleshcheyev (*ASISR*, I, No. 562, pp. 439-42) and Vasily Borisovich Tuchko Morozov (*ibid.*, No. 612, pp. 523-5); see also J. Blum, *Lord and Peasant in Russia from the Ninth to the Nineteenth Century*, Princeton, 1961, p. 202.

⁹² *Vremennik*, X, 'Materialy', p. 225.

⁹³ This was certainly the case for Dmitry Volodimirovich Khovrin, youngest son of the boyar Vladimir Grigor'yevich Khovrin (*Vremennik*, X, 'Materialy', p. 89; Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 44), who became *kaznachey* around 1494/5 (*DRK*, p. 19; *DRV*, XX, p. 8). He never so much as led a detachment into battle, as did most of the other boyars. Only on one known occasion did he leave Moscow in an official capacity, and that was in 1495, when he joined the retinue of the grand prince for the state visit to Novgorod (*DRK*, p. 19). This is the only mention of Dmitry Khovrin in the *Razryadnaya kniga*. There are numerous citations attesting his participation in diplomatic activities at court (see *SIRIO*, XXXV, XLI, *PDS*, I).

Ivan III inherited his first *dvoretskiy* from his father's administration. According to the Belyayev list (*Raspis' dvortsovykh chinov*), Mikhail Fyodorovich Saburov was *dvoretskiy* for the first year of Ivan III's reign, that is, to 1463/4 (Zimin, 'O sostave', *Istoricheskiye zapiski*,

man of the *duma*, who was also the governor of the capital and the military prefect, rarely absented himself, and then only on military matters in exceptional circumstances.⁹⁴ The remaining boyars led the armies on major campaigns.⁹⁵

LXIII, p. 203); according to the Sheremetev list, there were two *dvoretskiye* in 1462, Suburov and Grigorey Vasil'yevich Zabolotsky. Saburov, according to this list (*DRV*, XX, p. 2), died in 1463/4. Veselovsky (*ASISR*, I, p. 613) believed that Saburov acquired boyar rank towards the end of Vasily I's reign, i.e. prior to 1425. During the civil wars he transferred allegiance to Prince Dmitry Shemyaka of Galich. In 1447 Shemyaka entrusted Saburov with the mission of escorting the captive Grand Princess Sofia (mother of Vasily II) back to her son in Moscow. Saburov never returned to Shemyaka, defecting to the side of Vasily II. Presumably in return for his service and continued loyalty, Saburov reentered grand-princely employ as *dvoretskiy*. Whether he was actually admitted to the *duma* as a boyar is not known. He died without leaving any male heirs.

The information about Saburov's immediate successor is confusing. In the Belyayev list it is recorded that Grigorey Vasil'yevich Zabolotsky became *dvoretskiy* for a year upon the death of Saburov (Zimin, 'O sostave', *Istoricheskiye zapiski*, LXIII, p. 203 and pp. 181–2); in the Sheremetev list (*DRV*, XX, p. 2) Saburov and Zabolotsky are recorded as joint holders of the office, Saburov dying in 1463/4 and Zabolotsky in 1473 (*ibid.*, p. 3). The Sheremetev list further records that, upon the death of Saburov, Mikhaylo Yakovlevich Rusalka Morozov became *dvoretskiy*. But it is not evident from the source whether Zabolotsky continued in the office until his demise. All that is certain is that Zabolotsky had been a boyar in the later reign of Vasily II and continued as one into the subsequent reign (so Veselovsky, *ASISR*, I, p. 613). Worthy of note is that none of these boyars took part in any military campaigns or received posts as *namestniki*. While the evidence for these assertions is rather thin, we are also in want of proof to show that the state stewards ever received governorships over Muscovite towns or districts.

Concerning Mikhaylo Yakovlevich Rusalka Morozov we are better informed. The Belyayev list (Zimin, 'O sostave', *Istoricheskiye zapiski*, LXIII, p. 203), and the Sheremetev list as well, suggest that Morozov became *dvoretskiy* in 1465. But the way to the top was much slower than these sources indicate. Though Mikhaylo Yakovlevich, as a junior boyar, was among those to free Vasily II in 1446 (*PSRL*, XXV, p. 267), he did not achieve the rank of *okol'nichiy* until 1465, or perhaps a bit later. The first indication of his elevation, as reflected in extant official documentation, is for 1475 (*DRK*, p. 11). By 1490 he became a boyar, one of the few to reach the top via the administrative route (*SIRIO*, XXXV, No. 12, pp. 50–1). The notices we have do not indicate that he participated in land disputes appealed to the grand-princely court, or that he took part in any administrative functions outside the duties demanded by his office. He was one of the few of boyaral rank to receive a land grant in Novgorod, after the division of that territory into *pomest'ya*. (See Veselovsky, *Feodal'noye zemlevladieniye*, I, p. 296.)

⁹⁴ Prince Ivan Yur'yevich Patrikeyev, frequently mentioned as a military commander in his early career—which went back to the 1450s (*PSRL*, XXV, pp. 273, 276; IV, p. 148)—took less part in such activity during the reign of Ivan III. This change coincided with his elevation to the office of military prefect of Moscow. In 1478 he participated, as did most of the council boyars, in the great offensive against Novgorod (*DRK*, p. 12). In 1480 he was, as senior boyar, charged with the defence of the capital during the crisis engendered by Khan Ahmed's invasion (*PSRL*, IV, p. 153; VI, p. 225). Thereafter he rarely led forth the Moscow regiment. In 1485/6, when the deposed Grand Prince Mikhail of Tver' attempted to launch an invasion from Lithuanian soil, Ivan III despatched Prince Ivan Yur'yevich with the Moscow garrison force to drive him back (*PSRL*, XXIII, p. 162).

His successor, the much younger Prince Vasily Kholm'sky, participated in several major campaigns at the turn of century, in 1502 and in 1504/05 (*DRK*, pp. 31, 33; *PSRL*, XXVI, p. 296).

⁹⁵ See *DRK*, p. 12, for the principal military chiefs in the Novgorodian campaign of 1477/8: Prince Ivan Yur'yevich Patrikeyev, Vasily Obrazets, Vasily and Ivan Borisovich (Tuchko-Morozov), Prince Semyon Ryapolovsky and Prince Aleksandr Vasil'yevich Obolensky; 1482: Prince Ivan Vasil'yevich Bulgak (*DRK*, p. 13); 1487/8: Prince Danilo Dmitriyevich Kholm'sky (*ibid.*, p. 14); 1489: Prince Danilo Vasil'yevich Shchenya (*ibid.*, p. 15); 1492: Prince Danilo Kholm'sky and Yakov Zakhar'yevich (*ibid.*, p. 15), etc.

These are a few examples chosen from the military register. Chronicle information will support and amplify the generalisation. It may be noted that the policy of having boyars as commanders on major campaigns and junior boyars in charge of smaller ventures was

As noted earlier, with the exception of the boyar assigned to Novgorod as senior viceroy, дума members rarely received governorships of provinces or towns. This exception constituted an innovation. From 1478—that is, from the moment of the formal incorporation of Novgorod into the Muscovite realm—Ivan III designated two governors to administer the affairs of the former republic. The senior one was *always* a member of the дума throughout Ivan III's reign.⁹⁶ This vast territory—greater in size than that of its

an inheritance from the later reign of Vasily II. In the early 14th century, when the governing family was small, the princes placed great responsibility upon the boyars for military leadership. But even Dmitry Donskoy, who paid such great tribute to his boyars in his death-bed testimonial, relied heavily upon his cousin, Prince Vladimir Andreyevich, for military direction. Vasily I surrendered to his brothers and cousins responsible military commands, in large part because they added their contingents to the grand-princely levies. During the minority of Vasily II the loyal uncles served as regents and army leaders. But it was during those turbulent and trying days of civil war that a pronounced shift took place. The lack of political reliability and the frequent ineptitude of royal relatives led to their displacement by loyal and talented senior servitors. A study of the last years of Vasily II's reign suggests that the quickness of promotion to boyar rank depended in considerable measure upon military successes. Throughout the second half of the 15th century there is a continuing evolution in the process of utilising veteran servitors as senior commanders. Lower-ranking warriors acquired their experience in inferior assignments. As the foreign policy of Muscovy turned more active and the huge size of Muscovy forced the creation of regional defence forces, the functions previously exercised by the regional princes now fell to veteran commanders who had reached дума rank. While this was still an age far from specialisation, when дума appointees performed a variety of tasks, it is nonetheless noteworthy that the boyars by and large concerned themselves with military matters in time of war, and the *okol'nichye* remained the principal administrators performing court duties.

This premium on military function had much to do with the increasing prominence of a number of princely families residing in recently annexed territories. More and more of them enrolled in Muscovite service, where they were assigned to the military. A perusal of the military register (*DRK*) indicates that they took advantage of the Muscovite need for professional fighting men and converted it to their benefit, for they began to dominate the ranks of the lower echelon commands by the fourth quarter of the 15th century. Princes by birth, and thereby claiming superiority over the untitled, they wanted to displace the scions of the old Muscovite serving families. The policy of encouraging defections to Moscow and the desire to win the services of so many able-bodied servitors eased the decision to fill prime low- and medium-ranking military commands with these titled newcomers. In time the replacements for some of the first tier of дума personnel were to come from the ranks of these recent arrivals to service.

⁹⁶ This statement is difficult to substantiate from studies currently available. Two interesting lists have appeared in recent years, endeavouring to establish the identities of the Novgorodian *namestniki*. One is Pronshteyn's (*Velikiy Novgorod*, pp. 259 ff.) and the other Zimin's ('Spisok *namestnikov*', *AE* 1960, pp. 33–6). Neither is complete, though Zimin's is far superior. To use either without caution, however, would lead to error in generalisation. Because the evidence is incomplete, only single *namestniki* are entered for a number of years. In some instances, the single entry identifies a junior boyar, who could not possibly have been the senior *namestnik*. For example, *okol'nichiy* Pyotr Mikhaylovich Pleshcheyev is listed by Zimin (Pronshteyn's list is very similar) as having been *namestnik* in Novgorod in January 1491, May 1493 and January–February 1495. We may assume from these citations that he was actually *namestnik* between 1491 and 1495. For none of these years is a second *namestnik* mentioned, where there should have been one of boyar rank. Pronshteyn certainly admitted in the text of his volume that 'from the moment of its annexation to Moscow, in Novgorod there lived simultaneously two *namestniki*, possessing equal rights and position' (*Velikiy Novgorod*, p. 204). While the second part of his statement is subject to revision, the first part is correct. V. N. Bernadsky in his excellent *Novgorod i novgorodskaya zemlya v XV veke* (Moscow/Leningrad, 1961) bears this out indirectly through several citations (pp. 332, 333, n. 102). The senior *namestnik* in Novgorod in the second half of the 1480s to 1495 at least was Yakov Zakhar'yevich, a boyar of the дума. This was noticed by Bernadsky (p. 332) from a close reading of the military register.

conqueror, although more sparsely inhabited—demanded that it be administered by governors with viceregal powers resident in the Novgorodian capital. The responsibilities given these viceroys, whose area of jurisdiction adjoined hostile territory, necessitated the assignment of trusted and experienced administrators who were also veteran army commanders. Moreover, many served in the post of senior namestnik for unusually long periods of time. Yakov Zakhar'yevich Koshkin served as senior viceroy for a full decade (1485–95) during which Moscow firmly established its control over the territory. In the subsequent ten-year period only three boyars served as senior viceroys. With the sole exception of an okol'nichiy, Pyotr Mikhaylovich Pleshcheyev (1490–95), subordinate viceroys were not дума members. The post was considered so important that the junior governors were selected from veterans in the upper-echelon military and administrative ranks. Several subsequently became members of the grand-princely council.⁹⁷

The office of subordinate viceroy appears to have been a highly sought-after position as well as a responsible one. Success in this office undoubtedly enhanced a candidate's chances of дума membership. Moreover, the experience gained profited the monarchy in the decisions to be made by дума participants. In time of war these viceroys commanded the Novgorodian contingents against the Livonian Knights, the Lithuanians, and Tver' in the 1485 campaign that ended its independence. Beyond that Ivan III empowered his viceroys to conduct diplomatic negotiations and even permitted them to sign treaties in his name.⁹⁸ It seems certain that they first won approval from Moscow.

Ivan III could hardly have relied upon his brothers to fulfil these large responsibilities. He suspected their political reliability and resolved to limit their rôle in the affairs of state. Hence they were

Strangely enough, Pronshteyn, who spotted the same evidence, interpreted it too narrowly—and hence missed its significance. He stated that 'at the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th century this same namestnik, Yakov Zakhar'yevich, repeatedly led out the Novgorodian regiments against Lithuania and the Swedes' (*Velikiy Novgorod*, p. 205). He might well have asked himself what a boyar was doing leading the Novgorodian forces, if he were not the senior namestnik and voyevoda. On the very same page Pronshteyn stated: 'The namestniki commanded the Novgorodian army.' Hence, in revising the lists of Novgorodian namestniki, it would seem advisable to suggest that when a voyevoda of boyar rank led out the Novgorodian levies, he was, in effect, the senior assigned namestnik in the former republic.

Despite the paucity of evidence for the early years after annexation, it is possible to see that even at the very beginning the Muscovite court established a pattern whereby the senior namestnik was a member of the royal council. In 1478 Ivan named as first senior governor of Novgorod Prince Ivan Vasil'yevich Striga Obolensky (a boyar) and his brother, Prince Yaroslav Vasil'yevich Obolensky, who died without having reached the top rank. Cf. Appendix III for the boyar namestniki.

⁹⁷ See Appendix III: Yuri Zakhar'yevich Koshkin, Prince Danilo Aleksandrovich Penko Yaroslavsky and Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Nemoy Shuysky all became boyars.

⁹⁸ Pronshteyn, *Velikiy Novgorod*, pp. 206 ff.

but rarely called upon, as their predecessors had been, to command armies on great campaigns. They were certainly not allowed to participate in the consolidation of royal power.

IV

The okol'nichiye, as well as the majority of boyars, spent most of their time in court residence. Okol'nichiye generally appear to have had no great gifts in military matters. Both their normal routes of service advancement and their infrequent assignment to posts demanding military aptitude indicate that their talents lay elsewhere. Only a few participated in military ventures or served as provincial administrators in special circumstances. Most busied themselves with domainal, court and occasional diplomatic assignments. These generalisations require further discussion.

For some okol'nichiye evidence of military, diplomatic or judicial service is not recorded in the available sources. Undoubtedly Pyotr Fyodorovich Davydov, Grigorey Fyodorovich Davydov and Afanasy Stepanovich Sakmyshev served in posts concerned with court economy or administration. Ivan Vasil'yevich Chebot similarly served at court; on several occasions he acted as an adviser in judicial disputes,⁹⁹ and in only one known instance was he appointed a provincial governor.¹⁰⁰ Ivan Vasil'yevich Oshchera also stayed close to the court administration, never serving as namestnik or in a military command. It is presumed that he had been an okol'nichiy at the end of Vasily II's reign, continuing in that of his son Ivan III.¹⁰¹ But either on the death of Vasily II or shortly after, there is a suspicion that he entered the service of Ivan III's brother, Prince Yury Vasil'yevich of Dmitrov.¹⁰² After 1472 he is again found in the grand-princely retinue; by 1475 Ivan III raised him to okol'nichiy rank.¹⁰³ Ivan III's liking for him may have accounted for his readmission into the duma, though his previous service and experience should not be overlooked as a factor. According to one chronicle, this okol'nichiy was one of the close confidants of the grand prince in 1480 who urged his lord to make peace rather than fight Khan Ahmed.¹⁰⁴ There is some indication that he adjudicated land disputes brought before the grand-princely court.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁹ *ASISR*, I, No. 536, p. 412; II, No. 400, p. 408.

¹⁰⁰ See above, p. 90.

¹⁰¹ So *DRV*, XX, p. 2.

¹⁰² In 1472 he was one of the three lay witnesses to that prince's testament: *DDG*, No. 68, p. 224.

¹⁰³ *DRK*, p. 11.

¹⁰⁴ *PSRL*, VI, p. 230. Ivan III must have valued Oshchera highly, for he took him with him on his two visits to Novgorod: *DRK*, pp. 11, 13.

¹⁰⁵ *ASISR*, I, No. 430, pp. 318–20.

Pyotr Grigor'yevich Loban Zabolotsky played some part in ceremonial and diplomatic functions. He accompanied Ivan III on his state visit to Novgorod in 1495.¹⁰⁶ Later that year he became a member of the ceremonial cortège that accompanied the grand prince's daughter to Lithuania, where she was to marry Grand Prince Aleksandr.¹⁰⁷ Two years later he again journeyed to Lithuania, this time as a diplomat with instructions to dissuade Aleksandr from attacking Muscovy's ally Moldavia.¹⁰⁸

Pyotr Mikhaylovich Pleshcheyev, like Ivan Shchadra Vel'yaminov,¹⁰⁹ enjoyed a more varied experience than most of his fellow okol'nichiye. He became an okol'nichiy some time prior to October 1487.¹¹⁰ Later he served as second viceroy in Novgorod (1491-5) under the tutelage of boyar Yakov Koshkin.¹¹¹ He subsequently assumed both military and diplomatic duties. In June 1497 Ivan III assigned him to a force sent against the Livonian Knights with the apparent purpose of negotiating with the Germans.¹¹² 1499/1500 found him as the namestnik in Kozel'sk¹¹³ in the recently annexed Lithuanian lands; as military governor he served under Yakov Zakhar'yevich in the 1500 campaign against Putivl'.¹¹⁴ Towards the end of the second Lithuanian war Ivan despatched him to Lithuania to discuss armistice terms.¹¹⁵

Andrey Mikhaylovich Pleshcheyev, an elder brother of Pyotr Mikhaylovich, was one of very few okol'nichiye to attain the rank of boyar in this reign. Unlike his more versatile brother, he made his way up through the civil administration; his name does not appear in the military register. He became an okol'nichiy by 1475¹¹⁶ and continued to serve at court. He and his brother Pyotr went to Lithuania in 1482 to negotiate a safe conduct for Yelena of Moldavia, who was to marry the heir to the throne, Ivan Ivanovich.¹¹⁷ When Khan Ahmed invaded Muscovy in 1480, Ivan III sent his wife and his personal treasure to Beloozero for safe-keeping. Along with the grand princess he sent the boyar Vasily Borisovich Tuchko Morozov, the okol'nichiy Andrey Mikhaylovich Pleshcheyev, and his secretary Vasily Dolmatov,¹¹⁸ thus demonstrating his confidence in their

¹⁰⁶ *DRK*, p. 19.

¹⁰⁷ *SIRIO*, XXXV, No. 31, p. 163.

¹⁰⁸ *PSRL*, VI, p. 42.

¹⁰⁹ See above, p. 85.

¹¹⁰ *SIRIO*, XXXV, No. 1, p. 1, n. 1; p. 4.

¹¹¹ See Appendix III.

¹¹² *DRK*, p. 24.

¹¹³ *SIRIO*, XXXV, p. 282.

¹¹⁴ *DRK*, p. 26.

¹¹⁵ *PSRL*, VI, pp. 48-9; *SIRIO*, XXXV, p. 412.

¹¹⁶ *DRK*, p. 11.

¹¹⁷ *PSRL*, VI, pp. 234-5.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, VI, pp. 224-5.

loyalty and honesty. Five years later Ivan III assigned Pleshcheyev, with boyar Grigory Vasil'yevich Morozov, joint governor of Moscow while he personally led the campaign against Tver'.¹¹⁹ In 1490 Andrey Pleshcheyev, now a boyar, acted as court receptionist in greeting an envoy of King Maximilian.¹²⁰

Prince Ivan Ivanovich Zvenets Zvenigorodsky, who first appeared as a military servitor in the 1460s and 1470s,¹²¹ became an okol'nichiy in or before 1490¹²² and died six years later while on a diplomatic mission to the Crimea.¹²³

These meagre gleanings strongly indicate that the okol'nichye busied themselves largely with court and administrative assignments, that few derived profit from lucrative governorships, and that only a few served in military positions.

V

The above-cited and other items of evidence in the mosaic of careers in which lamentably so many stones are missing suggest that talent, evidence of success and proven ability played some rôle in determining assignments to responsible positions and in selecting candidates who would in time be admitted to the дума. One looks in vain for evidence of failure in the careers of those who became дума members. They apparently discharged their duties with efficiency and loyalty. This is not to say that merit alone governed selection. Certainly family connections, advantageous marriages and even close friendships played their time-honoured part in affecting decisions concerning promotion and assignment. Even the fragmentary information available hints at the powerful influence of marriage and family relations upon promotion.¹²⁴ But such connections were not as decisive as first impressions might suggest. We should be in error, for example, if we were to assume that because Prince Ivan Vasil'yevich Striga Obolensky was a boyar in the earlier years of Ivan III's reign,¹²⁵ his brothers Aleksandr and Pyotr Nagoy auto-

¹¹⁹ *DRK*, p. 14.

¹²⁰ *PDS*, I, col. 26.

¹²¹ *PSRL*, VI, p. 188.

¹²² *DRK*, p. 19.

¹²³ Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 47, n. 63.

¹²⁴ See Appendices I and II.

¹²⁵ Prince Ivan Vasil'yevich Striga Obolensky was the eldest of the six talented sons of Prince Vasily Ivanovich Obolensky. As a junior boyar he had served Vasily II with faithfulness and distinction (*PSRL*, XXV, pp. 267, 270, 274). He undoubtedly became a boyar in the later reign of Vasily II, since the Sheremetev list calls him boyar at the very outset of Ivan III's reign (*DRV*, XX, p. 2). Zimin's investigation ('Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 44 and n. 25) indicates that the documentary support for his ranking as a boyar can be dated between 1462 and 1464. Prince Ivan Striga's value as a boyar may be seen in the rôle he played in Yaroslavl' after its annexation in 1463. Ivan III assigned him as namestnik in the newly assimilated region, where he took measures to introduce Muscovite practices

matically won admittance to the duma.¹²⁶ We should be hard pressed to explain why the remaining three brothers were not allowed entry.¹²⁷

The duma had far too few openings to accommodate those who in earlier times would have won admittance by virtue of birth, influence and service. An inordinate pressure had developed by the

(*ASISR*, I, No. 338, p. 245 and p. 616). How long he served in this post is not known; thereafter he continued to serve as a senior general (*PSRL*, IV, p. 147; V, p. 275; VI, p. 187; XXVI, p. 222; A. V. Ekzemplyarsky, *Velikiye i udel'nyye knyaz'ya severnoy Rusi v tatarskiy period*, II, St Petersburg, 1891, p. 372. Apparently, Prince Ivan Striga's success in his Yaroslav' post prompted Ivan III to assign him as senior namestnik in Novgorod in 1478, immediately after the annexation (*PSRL*, VIII, p. 198; XXV, p. 332), but he died only a few months later (*PSRL*, VI, p. 19).

¹²⁶ Prince Aleksandr Vasil'yevich most probably served in a court position prior to his selection as a boyar in 1475 (*DRK*, p. 11; *DRV*, XX, p. 4). At least there is no record of his military career prior to this time. Thereafter, however, he took part in the major campaigns of the end of the century until his death in battle in 1501 (*DRK*, pp. 12, 15, 24; *PSRL*, IV, p. 156; VI, p. 207; XXVI, p. 295). Prince Pyotr Nagoy became a boyar in 1500. For his career see below, p. 104.

¹²⁷ Prince Vasily Ivanovich Obolensky had six sons, of which only the first, second and fourth became boyars. The third son, Yaroslav, the fifth, Vasily Telepen', and the sixth, Fyodor Telepen', did not. Prince Yaroslav first appears on the rolls of Muscovite service in 1478, when for a short time he became a divisional namestnik in the city of Novgorod 'on the merchants' side' under the jurisdiction of his eldest brother, Prince Ivan Striga (*PSRL*, VIII, p. 198; *Pskovskiy letopisi*, I, Moscow/Leningrad, 1941, p. 75). The following year he was joint voyevoda of a detachment of local levies from Dmitrov and Borovich, sent to aid Pskov against the Livonian Knights (*PSRL*, VI, p. 234; *Pskovskiy letopisi*, I, p. 79). Between 1485 and 1488 he became the prince of Pskov. There he, his wife and a younger son caught the plague and died (*Pskovskiy letopisi*, I, pp. 80-1). While Prince Yaroslav served as prince of Pskov, there is considerable evidence that he was there on assignment by Ivan III. For no sooner did he die than the Pskovian chronicler recorded that Ivan III, in February 1489, sent his 'namestnik', Prince Semyon Romanovich Yaroslavsky, a future boyar, but then a rather high-ranking junior boyar of the court, to replace the deceased Prince Obolensky (*ibid.*, I, p. 81). Since Prince Semyon Romanovich eventually became a boyar, one may suspect that Prince Yaroslav might have attained this rank through the same route, had he lived. It should be of interest to note (i) that Ivan III assigned for the military defence of Pskov candidates who, from a Muscovite point of view that was shared by the Pskov chronicler, were namestniki of the grand prince, although Pskov maintained its *de jure* independence; and (ii) that this kind of service as prince in Pskov counted in the testing procedure for duma candidates. Further, we see another dimension of the accumulated experience of the duma membership and the advantages derived from having someone in the council who was personally conversant with Pskovian affairs. This aspect was missed by N. N. Maslenikova, *Prisoyedineniye Pskova k russkomu tsentralizovannomu gosudarstvu*, Leningrad, 1955, pp. 58 ff., in an otherwise interesting discourse on the increased dependence of Pskov on Muscovite suzerainty.

We know more about the youngest brother, Prince Fyodor, of this branch of Obolensky than of the next but youngest, Prince Vasily. Prince Fyodor Telepen' received only minor positions of trust in his early career. In 1492, when he was probably of middle age, he received his first significant assignment as a voyevoda of the reserve regiment in the 'northern' campaign (*DRK*, p. 16). Then in the same year he participated in the capture of Mchensk and brought its military governor to Moscow (*PSRL*, XXIII, p. 161). In 1494 he and his younger brother served as junior boyars assigned to ceremonial court functions (*SIRIO*, XXXV, No. 24, p. 113). The following year Prince Fyodor embarked upon a series of more important military assignments (*DRK*, pp. 19, 23, 24, 32), indicating that he had emerged in the upper echelons of command. His family connections stood him in good stead and he was one of the guests invited to the marriage of Prince Vasily Kholmisky to Ivan III's daughter in 1500. While still a junior boyar at the time (*DRK*, p. 9), he did become a boyar in the following reign, that is after 1505 (*SIRIO*, XXXV, No. 84, p. 483): 'I knyaz' velikiy Vasily Ivanovich vyslal k nim s otvetom boyarina knyaz'ya Fyodora Vasil'yevicha Telepnaya- Obolenskogo . . .' This information is not reflected in Zimin's compilation.

second half of the 15th century, due in part to the considerable influx of military servitors from neighbouring free or annexed territories. To a much greater degree this pressure derived from a sharp increase in the size of Muscovite boyaral families, which was symptomatic of a general increase in population. In the generation of the Obolensky family just mentioned there were twenty-three males. In the previous generation there had been only six, and in the one preceding that but three.¹²⁸ This is not an uncommon example.

What connection and influence did ensure was a position connected with the grand-princely court. The capital of Ivan III drew to it a large population, not only of artisans, merchants and a small army of labourers engaged in the reconstruction of the Kremlin, but also of warriors. The size of the city's population can be gauged from the fact that later, in the early 16th century, it contained 41,500 houses.¹²⁹ For those with the requisite influence the doors of opportunity opened with relative ease. They acquired positions either in the personal regiment of the grand prince (the *dvor*)¹³⁰ or in the lower ranks of the court or the administration.¹³¹ The grand prince chose from this reservoir of junior boyars (a rather confusing term denoting medium-ranking men of service) those who were to command regional garrison forces,¹³² to administer oaths of allegiance to individuals or groups in newly annexed areas,¹³³ or to serve him in a variety of ways. The exercise of these duties, which kept such fortunate men in frequent contact with the grand prince and other

¹²⁸ *Vremennik*, X, 'Materialy', pp. 240-2. ¹²⁹ *Commentaries on Muscovite Affairs*, p. 73.

¹³⁰ For excellent examples of the junior boyars of the *dvor*, see the composition of the suite accompanying Ivan III to Novgorod in 1475 (*DRK*, p. 11) and particularly in 1495 (*ibid.*, pp. 20-2). The latter list is particularly informative.

¹³¹ Take the excellent illustration found in the foreign policy papers dealing with Lithuania (*SIRIO*, XXV, No. 31, pp. 160-2). On 6 January 1495 a negotiating team of high-ranking Lithuanians arrived at Ivan III's court. After their initial audience with the grand prince, they retired to assigned quarters. Then Ivan III sent the customary mead to each of them. What interests us are the names of the servitors assigned this duty: Konstantin Grigor'yevich Zabolotsky, his brother Aleksey, and Ivan Grigor'yevich Mamonov. The Zabolotsky brothers were the third and fifth sons of the deceased boyar Grigorey Zabolotsky. Konstantin had already achieved some diplomatic experience, since he had been an envoy to the Crimea in 1492 (*Iosafouvskaia letopis'*, p. 184). He had also served as a census-taker and adjudicated land disputes in the name of the grand prince (*Akty otnosyashchiesya do yuridicheskogo byta drevney Rossii*, I, St Petersburg, 1857, No. 103/II, cols. 639-40; Veselovsky in *ASISR*, I, p. 634). In 1503 Ivan III promoted him to *okol'nichiy* (Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 48 and n. 82). The younger brother, Aleksey, despite his military and diplomatic service (see *DRK*, pp. 20, 25, 26; *PSRL*, XXVI, p. 296), did not make the grade and dropped from sight after 1504.

¹³² Any number of illustrations can be culled from the chronicles to illuminate this point; one will suffice, since indications of this development are contained elsewhere in this article. In 1469 Ivan III sent to Ustyug his voyevoda, Prince Danilo Vasil'yevich Yaroslavsky, a junior boyar, along with ten other members of the *dvor*. Since they were to participate in the campaign against Kazan', obviously their task was to recruit the local militia and lead them in the forthcoming venture (*PSRL*, VIII, p. 155).

¹³³ *Iosafouvskaia letopis'*, p. 114: 'A na pyat' kontsev [of Novgorod] poslal knyaz' velikiy svoikh detey boyarskikh i d'yakov svoikh, i priveli ikh vsek k tselovaniyu na toy zhe gramote: vse tselovali lyudi i zheny boyar'skiye i vdovy i lyudi boyar'skiye' (January 1478). See also p. 125 for a similar occurrence in Tver' in 1485.

important personages at court—at a time when relations between the court and its humbler servitors were becoming more impersonal—had a considerable effect upon the careers of this group. But the ladder leading into the *duma* was long and the climb arduous, even for those with relatives or friends within.

Prince Pyotr Vasil'yevich Nagoy Obolensky, who had an elder brother in the *duma*, served at least thirty-one years before he was promoted boyar.¹³⁴ Prince Semyon Romanovich Yaroslavsky was the first of his family to become a boyar. He first appears in the sources as a medium-ranking servitor in 1467.¹³⁵ He may have begun his service as early as 1463, when Muscovy annexed Yaroslavl'.¹³⁶ He served with distinction, and was occasionally rewarded with major commands; he too waited over thirty years before his elevation to senior council rank.¹³⁷ The same applied to Prince Semyon Ivanovich Ryapolovsky. As a youth in 1446 he and his brothers joined the partisans of Vasily II against the Galich pretender. He appears to have remained in grand-princely service, for in 1458 he served as a commander in the Kazan' campaign. Thereafter he dropped from sight of the chroniclers until 1477/78, when he emerged as a general in the Novgorodian campaign.¹³⁸ According to the Sheremetev list, Prince Semyon became a boyar in 1468/69.¹³⁹ The first documentary substantiation dates from January 1494.¹⁴⁰ He thus served some thirty years prior to becoming a boyar.

¹³⁴ The first mention of Prince Pyotr Nagoy comes in 1469, when he led a most unusual and motley contingent on the Kazan' campaign. The force consisted almost wholly of merchants of the Surozh corporation, cloth merchants, and sons of the smaller Muscovite merchantry, in addition to a number of other Muscovites, presumably artisans (*PSRL*, VI, pp. 188–9; *XXVI*, pp. 225–6). Prince Nagoy became a boyar in 1500 and died nine years later (*DRV*, XX, pp. 9, 14; Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 47 and n. 73). In the course of his long apprenticeship he served as a junior boyar of the grand-princely dvor (*DRK*, p. 11) and by the 1490s progressed to the position of a regimental commander (*DRK*, p. 18). In the year of his admission into the *duma* he was one of the principal generals in the Lithuanian war (*DRK*, p. 27; *PSRL*, XXIII, p. 196). It may be of some interest that in addition to family advantage he also had some peerless court connections. This is witnessed by the composition of the wedding party of Ivan III's daughter. Prince Pyotr Nagoy served as one of the 'best men' for the groom (*DRK*, p. 9).

¹³⁵ He led a detachment of junior boyars against the Cheremissians (*PSRL*, VIII, p. 153; *XXVI*, p. 223).

¹³⁶ *PSRL*, XXVII, p. 350.

¹³⁷ By 1485 he reached the point where he acquired positions of considerable military responsibility. Both in 1485 and in 1487/8 he served as a regimental commander on the Kazan' campaigns (*DRK*, pp. 14–15). In 1489 Ivan III assigned his 'namestnik', Prince Semyon Yaroslavsky, to Pskov as replacement for the recently deceased Prince Yaroslav Obolensky (*Pskovskiy letopisi*, I, pp. 80–1).

¹³⁸ *DRK*, p. 14.

¹³⁹ *DRV*, XX, p. 3. This information does not correspond with his assignment as prince of Pskov in 1489. Ivan III and his *duma* advisors appear to have followed a strict policy of not assigning anyone of *duma* rank to take charge of the responsibilities of prince while Pskov retained its *de jure* independence. Since Prince Semyon remained in Pskov until February 1491 (*Pskovskiy letopisi*, I, p. 81), he could not have become a boyar before his return to Moscow.

¹⁴⁰ *SIRIO*, XXV, p. 114; Zimin ('Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 46, n. 60), relying on the information from the *DRK*, used the 1495 date as the first reference to Prince Semyon as a boyar.

The apprenticeship of okol'nichiye was commensurately shorter than that of boyars. This may be seen from the career of Ivan Grigor'yevich Morozov, whose father had been a boyar between 1475 and approximately 1491.¹⁴¹ The younger Morozov may have begun his service as early as the mid-1480s, although the first indisputable reference to his service activity dates from January 1494.¹⁴² Thereafter he acquired a little military and considerable court experience¹⁴³ being appointed okol'nichiy by 1507.¹⁴⁴ Thus it took at least thirteen years before this son of a boyar completed his journeymanhood. Prince Ivan Ivanovich Zvenets Zvenigorodsky acquired his first significant command in 1468, as voyevoda of the Ustyug militia,¹⁴⁵ and became an okol'nichiy in about 1490,¹⁴⁶ having served for at least twenty years.

While these extended periods of service apparently applied to most duma candidates during the latter part of the 15th century, some exceptions were made. When political circumstances so dictated Ivan III dispensed with the usual testing period. Prince Danilo Kholmsky, who emigrated from Tver' to Moscow, and was perhaps the ablest of his line, served a journeymanhood of five to nine years before becoming a boyar.¹⁴⁷ Ivan III must have been elated to acquire the services of this high-ranking prince, whose brother was chief adviser to the grand prince of Tver'.¹⁴⁸ If he could retain him in Moscow other Tverian aristocrats might be induced to defect,

¹⁴¹ Grigorey Vasil'yevich Morozov, boyar from 1475 to at least 1489 or 1491 (*DRK*, p. 11; *DRV*, XX, p. 4; Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 45 and n. 40).

¹⁴² *SIRIO*, XXXV, No. 24, p. 134. In Zimin's 'Spisok namestnikov', *AE* 1960, p. 32, an Ivan Grigor'yevich is mentioned as namestnik in Ladoga in 1486/7. This may be Morozov.

¹⁴³ In 1495 he was a junior boyar in the retinue of Ivan III on the visit to Novgorod. He is listed in the membership of the military branch of the dvor, suggesting that he may have acquired some military experience with that organisation (*DRK*, p. 21). There is one specific indication that Ivan Grigor'yevich could serve in a military capacity. An entry under May 1501 in the military register (*DRK*, p. 28) notes an instruction: if Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich was in Novgorod and trouble started with Lithuania, I. G. Morozov was to become the voyevoda of the left regiment. From a reading of the text and from the absence of his name in the military register on other occasions or in the chronicle notices of military campaigns, it may safely be assumed that this Morozov made his way through the administrative *cursus honorum*. For some positive evidence of this, see *SIRIO*, XXXV, No. 24, p. 134.

¹⁴⁴ Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, pp. 48–9 and n. 89. He became an okol'nichiy by 1507: *PSRL*, VI, p. 52; first such mention in the *DRK* (p. 43) is for 1509.

¹⁴⁵ *PSRL*, VI, p. 188; VIII, p. 153.

¹⁴⁶ *PDS*, I, p. 26.

¹⁴⁷ The earliest mention of Prince Danilo Dmitriyevich Kholmsky in Muscovite service is under an entry of 1469, when he served as commander in the leading regiment in the Kazan' campaign (*PSRL*, V, pp. 174–275; V. S. Borzakovsky, *Istoriya Tver'skago knyazhestva*, St Petersburg, 1876, p. 199 and n. 951). In the 1471 attack on Novgorod, Kholmsky served with distinction (*PSRL*, XXVII, pp. 131, 133, 134; *DRK*, p. 12). In 1473/4 Ivan III sent him against the Teutonic Knights in command of a sizeable force, in response to an appeal from the Pskovians (*Pskovskie letopisi*, II, Moscow, 1955, pp. 196 ff.). He entered the duma in 1473/4 or by 1479. (According to the Sheremetev list, promotion came in 1473/4: *DRV*, XX, p. 4. Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 45 and n. 45 found first confirmation in 1479. I suspect that Kholmsky became a boyar in 1473/4, immediately

thereby weakening the military strength of Tver'. Significantly, when Ivan III promoted Prince Danilo to the rank of boyar, he first compelled him to swear never to leave his service.¹⁴⁹ Prince Danilo's second son Vasily did as well as his father. He too became a boyar after approximately five years of service;¹⁵⁰ but he married the grand prince's daughter.

VI

We may now offer some reflections on the *duma* membership of Ivan III's reign and its changing character and functions. First, there were far more boyar members in 1462 than in 1505. In the year of Ivan III's accession twelve or possibly thirteen enjoyed this rank; at the end of the reign only six boyars can be identified.¹⁵¹

Secondly, there was no fixed number of boyaral positions in the council during these years. From the existing information it is possible to state that Ivan III allowed the number of boyars to diminish in the late 1460s and early 1470s by refusing to make replacements for those who died or were expelled. Rather than jump to the conclusion that Ivan III inaugurated a change from past policy, one should remember that his father had to reward a considerable number of loyal servitors for their support in the succession wars that rocked Muscovy in the second quarter of the 15th century. Moreover, the defensive foreign policy pursued in the early years of the new reign did not require an expansion of the council. The membership rose again after the mid-1470s and by 1480 there were at least eleven boyars in the *duma*. Circumstantially, one may point to the danger of Novgorod's growing hostility and the possibility of war with Lithuania. The need to administer the newly incorporated Novgorodian lands and the increase of military activity in several areas may have contributed to the change. From the 1480s the number again declined. On the other hand, the ranks of the second-grade members, the *okol'nichiye*, increased by the end of the period to at least six, in a minimum council membership of twelve. If further examination proves these figures reliable, the total

after he took an oath never to leave Muscovite service). As a boyar, Kholmisky continued to serve as a senior general, in 1486/7 and 1487/8 against Kazan' (*PSRL*, IV, p. 156; XXIII, p. 162; XXVI, p. 287; *DRK*, p. 14) and in 1492 on the 'northern' campaign (*DRK*, p. 15). He was *voyevoda* again in 1492/3: *DRK*, p. 18.

¹⁴⁸ *PSRL*, XXVI, pp. 277-8.

¹⁴⁹ *SGGD*, I, Nos. 103-04, pp. 249-51.

¹⁵⁰ Vasily Kholmisky is first mentioned in 1495 as a junior boyar of the *dvor* (*DRK*, p. 20). According to Zimin ('Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 48 and n. 84), he was a boyar in June 1504. The Sheremetev list cites the date of his elevation as 1500. I suspect that Kholmisky became a boyar immediately upon marrying Ivan III's daughter in 1500. The first corroborative evidence of this is in a chronicle of 1502, in which Prince Vasily Kholmisky is called 'voyevoda and boyarin' (*PSRL*, XXVI, p. 296).

¹⁵¹ See Appendix I.

membership in most periods of the reign fluctuated between approximately twelve and fifteen.

The apparent change in the balance between boyars and *okol'nichiye* suggests the developing importance of administrative, judicial and ceremonial functions. The volume of reports from provincial governors, the issue of instructions, the keeping of records for tax purposes and raising military levies, the hearing of judicial appeals, the development of diplomacy with several foreign states, no longer made possible personal supervision by the grand prince. As the bureaus developed out of archaic institutions, state secretaries became important functionaries. Undoubtedly the *okol'nichiye* played a significant rôle in the supervision of some of the new activities, making periodic reports to the *duma* and helping to shape decisions. It should be noted that at the very time when Muscovy was expanding to the west, north and east—when its armies grew to meet increased responsibilities along expanded frontiers—and when persons of princely descent began to dominate the higher military posts,¹⁵² increasing the debilitating quarrels over rank and precedence—at such a time more than half of the *duma* personnel were becoming more deeply involved in ceremonial and administrative affairs.

The generalisation is often repeated that by the end of the 15th century the older Muscovite serving families were losing their seats in the *duma* to privileged titled newcomers. It is certainly true that the changing composition of personnel acquiring significant military commands at this time—from non-princely to princely, from old Muscovite to newly immigrated—would in time be reflected in the composition of the *duma*, for tradition and continued practice demanded that persons of outstanding military record be considered for council membership. While these pressures mounted towards the end of the 15th century, they were not reflected in the composition of Ivan III's *duma*. Only two princes (or possibly three) of the Yaroslavsky line and two Kholmisky princes managed to infringe the monopoly of the older serving Muscovite boyaral families. In part, the long apprenticeship demanded of *duma* candidates helped to postpone decisions concerning the entry of newcomers. Even more important, those already inside the *duma* showed an understandably greater preference for sons and relatives or for members of families of deceased colleagues. Thus the old privy councillors managed to maintain effective control over *duma* appointments until the 1520s and 1530s, when the newcomers made their first significant inroads. The politics generated by these pressures and the resistance to them

¹⁵² See p. 92, above.

need to be examined with an eye to the *duma*'s part in the dynastic struggle at the end of the 15th century.

The oligarchic cast of the *duma* membership intimates that the grand prince succumbed to pressures benefiting a number of select families. The price was minimal, for he derived inestimable gain from long years of loyal service by the many members of these families who vied for appointments and competed for promotion. Not all who entered upon the *cursus honorum* could possibly secure admittance to the council. Moreover, those who eventually won entry brought with them a composite fund of experience, a penchant for obedience, an intimate knowledge of varied problems encountered during their years of service, and a prudence fashioned by time. Success in their previous career undoubtedly played a considerable part in their selection.

Kurbsky, writing a century later in the 1570s, described the merit system in the early campaigns of Ivan IV: 'And should anyone show himself courageous in battle and stain his hands with the blood of the enemy, he would be honoured with gifts, both movable and immovable. And because of this certain of them, the most skilled, were elevated to higher ranks.'¹⁵³ This comment may readily be applied to the practices of the later 15th century. Another Kurbsky observation may be used for our purposes: 'Now at that time I and another comrade of mine were entrusted with the command of the Right Wing . . . although I was of tender years (for at that time I was still only about twenty-four years old); but nevertheless, thanks to the grace of my Christ, I achieved this rank not without reason, but I ascended by military degrees.'¹⁵⁴ Four years after assuming his first major command, Kurbsky became a boyar at the age of twenty-eight.¹⁵⁵ Young men were not appointed to Ivan III's council, but Kurbsky's reference to ascent from the lower ranks and 'tender years' with regard to major command is also valid for the earlier period. We do not know the acceptable age for beginning service. Presumably it was somewhere between fifteen and twenty. Certainly by the time a man of service received a position in which he would be mentioned by a chronicler as the holder of a command or an assigned position, he would be at least twenty. If we assume that the first notices of service were made at the average age of twenty, boyars would usually have been about fifty years old at the time of their selection, and *okol'nichiye* well over thirty.

If *duma* members received assignments both military and civil, some of which carried them far from the capital, it nevertheless

¹⁵³ *Kurbsky's History* . . . , p. 23.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. viii; *DRK*, p. 181; V. S. Ikonnikov, *Opyt russkoy istoriografii*, II/2, Kiev, 1908, pp. 1817 ff.

appears that Ivan III normally kept his councillors close at hand for most of their tenure; but we still need to know more about the duties assigned to them, particularly to the okol'nichiye. On the boyars we are somewhat better informed. One was assigned to the viceroyalty of Novgorod on an irregular basis, with no particular term of office. The state steward, the treasurer and the Moscow prefect, who was also the chairman of the дума, performed assigned court tasks. The remainder of the boyars served as generals on major campaigns and carried out prescribed duties in the provinces, but always for brief periods. They spent most of their time in Moscow, serving as councillors in ordinary and extraordinary matters. Although the evidence is more circumstantial than direct, it seems that Ivan III relied heavily upon the accumulated experience of his council. Herein lies one of our keys to the development of centralised procedures and methods in this period. The councillors not only helped to form policy but aided in its execution.

Building on Zimin's research and the resultant lists, we have attempted to show that the severe reduction in the дума's membership during Ivan III's reign, by methods which appear to be legitimate, invalidates the generalisations and conclusions drawn from the data of the 17th-century Sheremetev list. Significantly, there is no substantiation for the view that the дума was invaded by new princely immigrants. Further study is unquestionably desirable, not only of the дума, but also of the careers of numerous individuals whom we can identify in our sources as having served in the middle echelons of the Muscovite administration. Such investigations for this and subsequent reigns may disclose much about the working of the Muscovite autocracy.

APPENDIX I

Boyars in the Duma of Ivan III

THE first list below is from the Sheremetev copy of court ranks (*DRV*, XX). Boyars for whom Zimin found documentary proof are identified in capital letters. Dates of service from the Sheremetev list are listed under *Sh*; Zimin's under *Z*.

	<i>Sh</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
Mikhaylo Borisovich Ple-shcheyev	1462-7/8		
PRINCE IVAN YUR'YEVICH PATRIKEYEV	1462-99/ 1500	1462-99	Uncle of Princess Ivan Bulgak and Danilo Shchanya; father of Prince Vasily Kosoy Patrikeyev; boyar from the latter part of Vasily II's reign.
PRINCE IVAN VASIL'YEVICH STRIGA OBOLENSKY	1462-77/8	1462-78	His father, Prince Vasily Ivanovich, had been a boyar in the reign of Vasily II (<i>ASISR</i> , I, p. 198) and in the early years of Ivan III's reign (<i>A. Yu. B.</i> , No. 103/I, col. 639). Prince Ivan was the father of Archimandrite Vassian, later bishop of Tver' (after 1477) and brother of boyars Aleksandr Vasil'yevich and Pyotr Nagoy.
Mikhaylo Fyodorovich Saburov (dvoretskiy)	1462-3/4		Veselovsky believed that Mikhaylo Fyodorovich had been a boyar in the reign of Vasily I (1389-1425); no male heirs; daughter married Prince Yaroslav Vasil'yevich Obolensky, brother of boyars Ivan Striga, Pyotr Nagoy and Aleksandr Vasil'yevich. After a transfer of allegiance during the civil wars of the second quarter of the 15th century, Saburov returned to grand-princely service. According to the Sheremetev and Belyayev lists, Mikhaylo Fyodorovich was dvoretskiy in 1462/4 (<i>ASISR</i> , I, p. 613). The Saburovs were a well-connected wealthy family, but not very influential in the latter part of Ivan III's reign; they were related to the Vel'yaminovs and Godunovs. The Saburov political fortunes improved markedly but tem-

	<i>Sh</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
Mikhaylo Fyodorovich Saburov (dvoretskiy)— (<i>cont.</i>)	1462-3/4		porarily after 1506, when Vasily III married a lady from the most junior branch of the family.
GRIGORY VASIL'YEVICH ZABOLOTSKY (dvoretskiy)	1462-4	1462-4	An elder brother was killed at the battle of Belev, 1438; father of okol'nichiye Konstantin and Pyotr Grigor'evich Zabolotsky.
VASILY FYODOROVICH SABUROV	1464-85	1462-4	Younger brother of boyar Ivan Fyodorovich Saburov; father of future okol'nichiy (in Vasily's reign) Andrey Vasil'yevich Saburov.
MIKHAYLO YAKOVLEVICH RUSALKA MOROZOV (dvoretskiy)	n.d.-1501	1495-1501	Distant relative of Grigory Vasil'yevich Morozov; raised from okol'nichiy; see Appendix II.
PRINCE SEMYON ROMANOVICH YAROSLAVSKY	1469-1501/02	1495-1503/04	First of the family to become a Muscovite boyar. Daughter married okol'nichiy Pyotr Fyodorovich Davydov, son of boyar Fyodor Davydovich Khromoy.
FYODOR DAVYDOVICH KHROMOY	1470/1-1482/3	1475-7	Related to the Chelyadnins, Buturlins, Chebots and Osteyevs; second cousin to Andrey Romanovich Khrul' Osteyev; father of the okol'nichiy Grigory Fyodorovich Khromoy.
Dmitry Isakovich Boretskoy	1470/1-1/2		
PRINCE DANILO DMITRIYEVICH Kholm'sky	1473/4-1492/3	1479-1492/3	Niece Ul'yana married Prince Boris of Volok, brother of Ivan III. Prince Danilo Dmitriyevich was brother of the chief boyar of Tver' and married a daughter of the boyar Ivan Ivanovich (see n. 18), whose sister married Prince Ivan Vasil'yevich Bulgak Patrikeyev. Danilo's daughter married Ivan Golova, whose father had been a boyar in the early part of Ivan III's reign and whose brother Dmitry Volodimirovich was boyar-kaznachey in the latter part of the reign. His son Vasily subsequently married a daughter of Vasily III.

	<i>Sh</i>	<i>Ž</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
VASILY FYODOROVICH OBRAZETS SIMSKY	1472/3– 1483/4	1475–7?	Boyar from the early 1470s to at least 1485: see <i>PSRL</i> , XV, col. 500. Descended from a wealthy serving family, whose fortunes declined in the latter part of Vasily II's reign. His son, Ivan Khabar, married the daughter of boyar Dmitry Volodimirovich Khovrin; he subsequently became an okol'nichiy and later a boyar in the reign of Vasily III. See below under Dmitry V. Ovtza [Khovrin].
PRINCE IVAN VASIL'YE- VICH BULGAK	1475/6– 1478/9		Nephew of Prince Ivan Yur'yevich Patrikeyev; brother of boyar Prince Danilo Shchenya; married daughter of boyar Ivan Ivanovich (see under his name below). His sister-in-law married boyar Prince Danilo Kholmsky. His son Mikhailo became a boyar in the reign of Vasily III.
PRINCE DANILO VASIL'YE- VICH SHCHENYA	1475/6– 1514/15	1475–1515	Nephew of Prince Ivan Yur'yevich Patrikeyev; brother of Prince Ivan Bulgak; married daughter of Prince Ivan Vasil'yevich Gorbaty of the Shuysky family.
IVAN BORISOVICH TUCHKO MOROZOV (as Borozdin)	1475/6– 1500/01	1475– 1502/03	Identified in the Sheremetev list as I. B. Borozdin, who was killed by the Germans in 1500/01: <i>DRV</i> , XX, p. 10; in the <i>Rodoslovnaya kniga</i> published by Novikov (II, p. 141) Ivan Borisovich Borozdin and his brothers Pyotr and Vasily are called 'boyars in Moscow and in Tver'. Ivan Borisovich was killed on the Seritsa river, in the 'German lands' west of Pskov (<i>cf. PSRL</i> , XXV, p. 236). Zimin ('Sostav', p. 45) questioned the identification as Borozdin for Ivan and Vasily Borisovich, but left their names on the list. A check of the military register for the campaign of 1500/01 against the Germans (<i>DRK</i> , pp. 28–9) does not show a

	<i>Sh</i>	<i>Ž</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
IVAN BORISOVICH TUCHKO MOROZOV (as Borozdin)—(<i>cont.</i>)	1475/6– 1500/01	1475–85 1475– 1502/03	Borozdin in command of any unit, suggesting that he was certainly not of boyar rank. Veselovsky (<i>ASISR</i> , I, p. 633) identified 'Ivan and Vasily Borisovich' as Tuchko Morozov rather than Borozdin. This is a much more sensible suggestion, since the Morozovs were an influential Muscovite serving family. The brothers Borisovich, both boyars, were imprisoned by Ivan III in the autumn of 1484 for some serious but unknown crime. Ivan Borisovich served as dvoretskiy while boyar (<i>ASISR</i> , I, No. 330, p. 240).
Vasily Borisovich Borozdin	1475/6– 1502/03	1475–1501	See note above under Ivan Borisovich Tuchko Morozov.
GRIGORY VASIL'YEVICH MOROZOV	1475/6– 1491/2	1475–89	Father of future okol'nichiy Ivan Grigor'yevich Morozov (in the reign of Vasily III); first cousin to boyars Vasily and Ivan Borisovich Tuchko Morozov.
PRINCE ALEKSANDR VASIL'- YEVICH OBOLENSKY	1475/6– 1501/02	1475–1501	Younger brother of boyar Prince Ivan Striga Obolensky; elder brother of Prince Pyotr Nagoy Obolensky.
Grigory Nikitich Borozdin	1475/6– 1479/80		
Prince Mikhaylo Fyodoro- vich Mikulinsky	1477/8–?		
Ivan Zhito Nikitich Boroz- din	1477/8–?		
PRINCE SEMYON IVANO- VICH KHRIPUN RYAPO- LOVSKY	1477/8–99	1495/9	Nephew of Prince Dmitry Ivanovich Ryapolovsky, boyar in the early part of Ivan III's reign.
Semyon Fyodorovich Pe- shek Saburov	1477/8– 1483/4		
Prince Vasily Mikhaylo- vich Obolensky	1479/80– 1480/81		
YAKOV ZAKHAR'YEVICH [KOSHKIN]	1479/80– 1510/11	1479–1510	Elder brother of boyar Yuri Zakhar'yevich; son of future okol'nichiy Pyotr Yakovlevich and Vasily Yakovlevich. Pyotr subsequently became a boyar.
Prince Pyotr Mikhaylo- vich Obolensky	1479/80– 1481/2		

	<i>Sh</i>	<i>Ž</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
ANDREY MIKHAYLOVICH PLESHCHEYEV okol'nichiy	1475/6– 1479/80	1475– 1479/80?	Married cousin of Yakov and Yury Zakhar'yevich.
boyar	1479/80– 1490/1	1479/80?– 1491	
VASILY BORISOVICH TUCH- KO MOROZOV	1479/80– 1480/1	?–1485	First cousin to boyar Vasily Grigor'yevich Morozov; ar- rested in 1484 for some serious but unknown crime.
Fyodor Grigor'yevich Bo- rozdin	1479/80– 1493/4		
Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Shestun Yaroslavsky	1486/7– 1494/5		
Prince Pyotr Nikitich Obo- lensky	1492/3– 1498/9		
YURY ZAKHAR'YEVICH [KOSHKIN]	1492/3– 1503/04	1483–1500	Descended from an old Musco- vite boyaral family; brother of Yakov Zakhar'yevich; father of future okol'nichiy and boyar Mikhaylo Yur'yevich Zakha- rin.
Pyotr Borisovich Borozdin	1492/3– 1503/04		
Prince Fyodor Borisovich Khripun Ryapolovsky	1492/93– 1497/8		
PRINCE VASILY IVANOVICH KOSOY PATRIKEYEV	1494/5– 1499/1500	1495–9	Son of Prince Ivan Patrikeyev; cousin to Princes Ivan Bulgak and Danilo Shchenya.
ANDREY FYODOROVICH CHELYADNIN	1494/5– 1499/1500	1495– 1499/1500	Brother of Peter Fyodorovich Chelyadnin; father of future boyars Vasily and Ivan Andre- yevich Chelyadnin; son of boyar Fyodor Mikhaylovich.
konyushiy after	1495/6		
Prince Semyon Danilovich Kholmsky	1494/5– 1500/01		
Prince Osip Andreyevich Dorogobuzhsky	1494/5– 1529/30		
Prince Ivan Mikhaylovich Telyatevsky	1494/5– 1511/12		
Prince Volodimir Andreyev- vich Mikulinsky	1494/95– 1508/09		
DMITRY VOLODIMIROVICH OVTSA [KHOVRIN]	1496/7– 1509/10	1495– 1502?	Boyar at least to 1509: <i>SIRIO</i> , XXXV, No. 84, p. 489. Son of boyar Vladimir Grigor'yevich; brother Ivan Volodimirovich married daughter of boyar Prince Dmitry D. Kholmsky. Had two daughters: the elder married Ivan Grigor'yevich Morozov, who became an okol'nichiy and then a boyar

	<i>Sh</i>	<i>Ž</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
DMITRY VOLODIMIROVICH OVTSA [KHOVRIN]— (<i>cont.</i>)	1496/7— 1509/10	1495— 1502?	in the reign of Vasily III; the younger daughter married Prince Mikhaylo Vasil'yevich Kisly, of the Shuysky family, who later became okol'nichiy and then boyar in the reign of Vasily III (<i>Vremennik</i> , X, 'Materialy', pp. 89, 227). According to another genealogical register, referred to by Zimin ('Sostav', p. 49, n. 95), Dmitry Khovrin's elder daughter married Ivan Vasil'yevich Khabar, son of the boyar Vasily Obrazets, who later became okol'nichiy and then boyar in the reign of Vasily III. Dmitry Volodimirovich's sister married Prince Ivan Yur'yevich Patrikeyev.
PRINCE VASILY DANILO- VICH K HOLMSKY	1499/1500— 1523/4	1500—08	Son of Prince Danilo Dmitriyevich Kholmsky; married Princess Feodosiya, daughter of Ivan III; imprisoned in 1508.
PRINCE DANILO ALEKS- ANDROVICH PENKO YARO- SLAVSKY	1499/1500— 1519/20	1500—?	Son of Prince Aleksandr Fyodorovich, the last reigning prince of Yaroslavl'.
PRINCE PYOTR VASIL'YE- VICH NAGOY OBOLENSKY	1499/1500— 1509/10	1500—09	Fourth of six sons of boyar Prince Vasily Ivanovich Obolensky; elder brothers Ivan Striga and Aleksandr also became boyars. His next elder brother, Yaroslav, was prince of Pskov upon assignment of Ivan III, and probably would have become a boyar had he not died of the plague in 1488.
Prince Dmitry Volodimi- rovich Rostovsky	1500/01— 1517/18		
Dmitry Vasil'yevich Shein [Morozov]	1500/01— 1505/6		
Prince Aleksandr Volodi- mirovich Rostovsky	1500/01— 1522/3		
Semyon Ivanovich Voront- sov	1503/04— 1517/18		

Zimin added the following names of boyars, based upon documentary references:

	<i>Ž</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
IVAN FYODOROVICH STARKOV	c. 1462—84	His father, Fyodor Andreyevich Starko, was identified by Veselovsky as a boyar

<p>ИВАН ФЬОДОРОВИЧ СТАРКОВ <i>o.</i> 1462–84 (<i>cont.</i>)</p>	<p>З</p>	<p><i>Relationships</i> earlier in the 15th century (<i>ASISR</i>, I, p. 612). Ivan Fyodorovich was a boyar certainly before 1478, i.e. before the death of Prince Ivan Striga Obolensky (<i>ASISR</i>, II, p. 365). Ivan Fyodorovich's son Aleksey was a court servitor, used at least once in the 1470s as an envoy to the Crimea. Aleksey's sons served under the command of the postel'nichiy, but none became дума members.</p>
<p>ВЛАДИМИР ГРИГОР'ЕВИЧ 1462–4 [KHOVRIN]</p>		<p>Of Greek descent; the first of his line to become important; probably a merchant, certainly a man of wealth; daughter married Prince Ivan Yur'yevich Patrikeyev. His eldest son, Ivan Golova, married daughter of boyar Prince Danilo Kholm'sky; his youngest son, Dmitry, became a boyar and state treasurer.</p>
<p>ПРИНЦ ДМИТРИЙ ИВАНОВИЧ 1462–84 РЯПОЛОВСКИЙ</p>		<p>Probably died very early in the reign of Ivan III; boyar in the late 1450s (if not earlier) and early 1460s; childless. Uncle of Prince Semyon Ivanovich Ryapolov'sky, boyar in the latter part of the 15th century.</p>
<p>АНДРЕЙ РОМАНОВИЧ 1462–84 [KHRUL' OST'EYEV]</p>		<p>Probably died in the 1460s. Uncle of okol'nichiy Ivan Vasil'yevich Chebot; second cousin to boyar Fyodor Davydovich Khromoy. Related to the Buturlins and Chelyadnins, being descended from Andrey Gavrilovich, who served in Moscow at the beginning of the 14th century.</p>
<p>ПЬОТР ФЬОДОРОВИЧ [CHEL- 1475–9 YADNIN]</p>		<p>Identified erroneously by Zimin ('Sostav', p. 45) as Khromoy. Pyotr Fyodorovich Khromoy only became an okol'nichiy in the later part of Ivan III's reign: so also Zimin, p. 48. This Pyotr Fyodorovich was the brother of boyar Andrey Fyodorovich Chelyadnin, son of boyar Fyodor Mikhaylovich.</p>
<p>ИВАН [ФЬОДОРОВИЧ Ус'] 1483</p>		<p>Descended from a fairly undistinguished branch of servitors. His great-great-grandfather was Ivan Morkhina, brother of Akinf Gavrilovich. Ivan's father, Fyodor, had been an ambassador of the Muscovite court to Prince Yury of Galich in an attempt to make peace (<i>PSRL</i>, VIII, p. 97). Ivan Fyodorovich's son, Ivan Ivanovich, became an okol'nichiy of Ivan III.</p>

	Ж	<i>Relationships</i>
PRINCE VASILY IVANOVICH [OBOLENSKY]	1462-4	Identified by Zimin only by first name and patronymic. Surname as ascribed by Veselovsky (<i>ASISR</i> , p. 612). Boyar at least from the mid-1450s; father of boyars Ivan Striga, Aleksandr Vasil'yevich and Pyotr Nagoy.
VASILY IVANOVICH KITAY [NOVOSIL'TSEV]	1475-7	Boyar at least from 1461/2. See above, note 27. Last mention in 1477 as namestnik of Torzhok (<i>PSRL</i> , XVIII, p. 255). Descended from 14th-century serving family.

Overlooked by Zimin in the compilation of his list:

	<i>Dates of Service</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
FYODOR VASIL'YEVICH [BASYONOK]	1460	Descended from an untitled and non-noble family; made his fame and fortune as a strong supporter of Grand Prince Vasily II; a significant general in the mid-15th century, particularly in the Novgorodian campaign of 1456; rewarded with boyar's rank, probably in the 1450s. Maintained his influence to the death of Vasily II. Deposed, imprisoned and blinded upon order of Ivan III. Only member of the family to become a boyar. His son Nikifor was a trusted ambassador in the 1470s and apparently close to Ivan III in the 1480s. May have been an okol'nichiy, but the only evidence is the Sheremetev list.
IVAN IVANOVICH	1460s	Descendant of the senior branch of the family that claimed descent from Prince Aleksandr Vsevolod Glebovich; distantly related to the Zabolotskys; boyar in the latter part of Vasily II's reign and early part of Ivan III's reign. No sons, but four daughters who married well: one to boyar Prince Danilo Kholmsky; the second to boyar Prince Ivan Bulgak; the third to Semyon Bryukho Borisovich Morozov, brother of boyar Vasily Borisovich Tuchko Morozov; the fourth to Prince Vasily Mnikh Ivanovich Ryapolovsky, son of boyar Prince Semyon Khripun Ryapolovsky, who, despite thirty years of service, never entered the duma (notwithstanding information to the contrary in the Sheremetev list (<i>DRV</i> , XX, pp. 7, 8).

	<i>Dates of Service</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
FYODOR MIKHAYLOVICH [CHELYADNIN]	1460s–70s but before 1473	See Veselovsky, <i>ASISR</i> , I, p. 615. Boyar of Vasily II who continued service in the subsequent reign; related through his father to the Buturlins and Khromoys; his elder brother Ivan married Yelena, daughter of Prince Ivan Yur'yevich Patrikeyev; father of boyars Pyotr and Andrey Chelyadnin.
IVAN FYODOROVICH SABUROV	c. 1465–9	Elder brother of boyar Vasily Fyodorovich; younger brother of (boyar dvoretsky?) Mikhaylo Fyodorovich. His nephew Yury Konstantinovich (son of his youngest brother) became a boyar immediately after Grand Prince Vasily III married his daughter.
IVAN SUDIMONT KONDRAT'YE- VICH	c. 1469	Apparently a political appointment: an immigrant from Lithuania. No other Muscovite source except <i>AI</i> , I, No. 110. Not included in the <i>Rodoslovnyye knigi</i> . See footnote 30 above.

APPENDIX II

Okol'nichiye of Ivan III

This is the list of okol'nichiye found in the Sheremetev compilation. Those verified by Zimin are in capital letters. Dates of service from the Sheremetev list are listed under *Sh*; Zimin's under *Z*.

	<i>Sh</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
ANDREY MIKHAYLOVICH PLESHCHEYEV	1475/6– 1479/80	1475– 1479/80	Boyar after 1479/80: 'raised from okol'nichiy' (<i>DRV</i> , XX, p. 5). See Appendix I above.
IVAN VASIL'YEVICH OSH- CHERA	1462– 1485/6	1470s– c. 1493	Called okol'nichiy of Vasily II in the Sheremetev list (<i>DRV</i> , XX, p. 2). Called one of the anti-war councillors in 1480 (<i>PSRL</i> , VI, p. 230). Father of Ivan Ivanovich Oshcherin, who served Ivan III long and well; a favourite, but never achieved дума rank.
IVAN VASIL'YEVICH SHCHA- DRA VEL'YAMINOV	1475/6– 1525/6	1503– 1520s	Eldest son of Vasily Fyodorovich Vel'yaminov, who served as a boyar in the udel principality of Dmitrov in the 1470s.
Vasily Borisovich Tuchko Morozov	okol'nichiy before 1479/80		'[Raised to boyar] from okol'nichiy': <i>DRV</i> , XX, p. 5. See Appendix I above.
Fyodor Grigor'yevich Bo- rozdin	okol'nichiy before 1479/80		'[Raised to boyar] from okol'nichiy'; <i>DRV</i> , XX, p. 5.

	<i>Sh</i>	<i>З</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
Yurlo Mikhaylovich Pleshcheyev	1484/5– 1495/6		
Nikifor Fyodorovich Baskenkov	1486/7– 1502/03		Son of boyar Fyodor Basyonok; active as an ambassador in negotiations with Khan Ahmed in 1480.
Yury Ivanovich Shestak Kutuzov	1488/9– 1498/9		
Boris Vasil'yevich Kutuzov	1488/9– 1500/01		
PYOTR MIKHAYLOVICH PLESHCHEYEV	1494/5– 1503/04	1487– after 1510	Brother of okol'nichiy, later boyar Andrey Pleshcheyev.
PRINCE IVAN IVANOVICH ZVENETS [ZVENIGORODSKY]	1494/5– 1503/04	1495–6	Made okol'nichiy as early as 1490: <i>PDS</i> , I, col. 26.
PYOTR GRIGOR'YEVICH ZABOLOTSKY	1494/5– 1504/05	1495– before 1505	Second son of late boyar Grigory Vasil'yevich Zabolotsky; brother of okol'nichiy Konstantin Zabolotsky.
Ivan Oblyaz Vasil'yevich Vel'yaminov	1497/8– 1523/4		
IVAN VASIL'YEVICH CHEBOT	1499/1500– 1500/01	1490–1500	Descendant of Akinf Gavrilovich; father was first cousin of boyar Andrey Khrul' Osteyev; more distantly related to the Khromoy, Buturlins and Chelyadnins.
DANILO IVANOVICH	1499/1500– 1500/01	c. 1497– 1502	First cousin to Ivan III's favourite, Grigorey Mamon; descended from a rather unimportant serving family; grandson was to become a boyar in Ivan IV's reign.
Grigory Andreyevich Mamon	1499/1500– 1509/10		
GRIGORY FYODOROVICH DAVYDOV boyar	1500/01– 1505/06 1505/06– 1517/18	1501–07 1507–17	Son of boyar Fyodor Davydovich Khromoy; brother of okol'nichiy Pyotr Fyodorovich; distant relative of the Chebots, Buturlins, Chelyadnins; became a boyar in the reign of Vasily III.
PYOTR FYODOROVICH DAVYDOV	1500/01– 1514/15	1501–09	Son of boyar Fyodor Davydovich; brother of okol'nichiy, later boyar Grigory Fyodorovich.

	<i>Sh</i>	<i>З</i>	<i>Relationships</i>
AFONASY STEPANOVICH SAKMY SHEV	1500/01– 1509/10	1501–09	Erroneously identified as Afonasy Ivanovich Sakmyshev in the Sheremetev list; but see <i>Vremennik</i> , X, 'Materialy', p. 119. Descended from a Tverian serving family, according to this genealogy from boyars of Tver'; family history in Moscow undistinguished.
Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Romodanovsky	1500/01– 1511/12	after 1509	Boyar in the udel principality of Vereya until 1486; transferred to Muscovite service; no indication that he attained duma rank before the reign of Vasily III.
Ivan Grigor'yevich Mamono v	1502/03– 1504/05		Son of Grigory Andreyevich Mamon; served at court and as an occasional envoy; according to Zimin ('Sostav', p. 48, n. 81) he never became a duma member and died in 1516.
KONSTANTIN GRIGOR'YEVICH ZABOLOTSKY	1505/06– 1514/15	1503–12	Son of boyar Grigory Vasil'yevich Zabolotsky; younger brother of Pyotr Grigor'yevich Zabolotsky.
Added by Zimin:			
IVAN IVANOVICH TOVAR KOV		1484/5	Son of boyar Ivan Fyodorovich Tovarkov. See notes under his father's name.
Omitted by Zimin:			
MIKHAYLO YAKOVLEVICH RUSALKA MOROZOV (dvoretskiy)	1464/5– 1500/01		Listed as dvoretskiy and okol'nicliy in 1475 (<i>DRK</i> , p. 11); raised to rank of boyar by 1495 (<i>ibid.</i> , p. 19). According to the Sheremetev list, he died in the office of dvoretskiy, but with the rank of boyar (<i>DRV</i> , XX, p. 10).
PRINCE PYOTR VASIL'YEVICH [SHESTUN-YAROSLAVSKY]	to 1500/01 (deposed); 1503/04 (reinstated) to 1512/13		See footnote 27 above.

APPENDIX III

Namestniki in Novgorod

Duma members at the time of their governorships are recorded in capital letters. Namestniki who later became members of the дума are italicised.

Z = Zimin, 'Spisok namestnikov', *AE* 1960, pp. 27–42.

P = Pronshteyn, *Velikiy Novgorod*, Appendix 3, pp. 259 ff.

1478	PRINCE IVAN VASIL'YEVICH STRIGA	
	OBOLENSKY (d. spring 1478)	Z, P
	Prince Yaroslav Vasil'yevich Obolensky	
	(recalled spring 1478)	Z, P
1480}	Prince Vasily Fyodorovich Shuysky ¹	Z, P
1481}	Ivan Zinov'yevich	Z, P
1482	GRIGORY VASIL'YEVICH [MOROZOV]	<i>Sbornik Mukhanova</i> , No. 27, p. 39
	Prince Vasily Fyodorovich Shuysky	
1485	YAKOV ZAKHAR'YEVICH [KOSHKIN]	Z, P
1486	YAKOV ZAKHAR'YEVICH	Z, P
1487	YAKOV ZAKHAR'YEVICH	P
1488	YAKOV ZAKHAR'YEVICH	Z
	<i>Yury Zakhar'yevich</i> ²	
1489	YAKOV ZAKHAR'YEVICH	Z, P
	<i>Yury Zakhar'yevich</i>	
1490	YAKOV ZAKHAR'YEVICH	P
	PYOTR MIKHAYLOVICH [Pleshcheyev] ³	
	(okol'nichiy)	

¹ Prince Vasily Fyodorovich Shuysky remained a middle-ranking military administrator for the remainder of his life. In 1487/8 he was one of two men assigned to take reinforcements to the commanders on the Kazan' campaign (*DRK*, p. 18). Later, in the early 1490s, Ivan assigned him to the governorship of Pskov (1491: *Pskovskiy letopis'*, I, Moscow/Leningrad, 1941, p. 81) from whence he led forth the local militia on various Muscovite campaigns upon order of the grand prince (1492: *DRK*, p. 19; 1495: *Ioasafovskaya letopis'*, p. 190; *Pskovskiy letopis'*, II, Moscow, 1955, pp. 81–2).

² Yury Zakhar'yevich Koshkin, younger brother of the distinguished boyar, general and governor, Yakov Zakhar'yevich Koshkin, first emerges in the extant sources as a junior boyar in the dvor of Ivan III in 1479 (*DRK*, p. 13). His appearance as a junior governor of Novgorod in 1488 may in part reflect the influence of his brother, though his death in 1504 (Veselovsky in *ASISR*, I, p. 630) may also suggest that he had spent a number of years in service before 1488. Acquisition of the post of governor of Novgorod marked him as rather high up in the *cursus honorum* leading to дума rank. He had become a boyar by 1483 (Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 44, n. 30; *DDG*, No. 77, p. 292). In the 1490s he appears in the military register as a general (*DRK*, pp. 18, 24, 26, 27).

³ Pyotr Mikhaylovich Pleshcheyev, younger brother of okol'nichiy Andrey Mikhaylovich, was already an okol'nichiy by the time he went to Novgorod as junior governor (*SIRIO*, XXXV, No. 1, p. 4: first mention 1487). His assignment to Novgorod coincided with a period of considerable social discontent and administrative change. Beginning in 1487, the Moscow government decided to transfer a number of Novgorodian landowners to the Muscovite interior and to replace them with loyal military servitors. The unhappiness of the Novgorodians spawned a plot to murder the boyar governor of Novgorod, Yakov Zakhar'yevich. The conspirators were executed and the forcible removal of rich and landed Novgorodians went on apace for the next decade and a half (Bernadsky, *Novgorod i novgorodskaya zemlya v XV veke*, pp. 321–2). The assignment first of Yakov's brother Yury as his co-namestnik in 1488–9 and then of the okol'nichiy Pyotr Pleshcheyev suggests that loyal and experienced administrators helped first with the problem of restoring order and then with the more complicated matter of administering and institutionalising the assignment of pomest'ye lands. Pyotr Pleshcheyev's half-decade provided the firm hand of a

1491	PYOTR MIKHAYLOVICH	Z
1492	YAKOV ZAKHAR'YEVICH	DRK, p. 18: voyevoda in
1493	YAKOV ZAKHAR'YEVICH	Nov. SIRIO, XXV, No. 20, p. 85; No. 21. p. 94; Sb. Mukh., p. 49
	PYOTR MIKHAYLOVICH	Z, P
1494	PYOTR MIKHAYLOVICH	Z, P
1495 (early)	YAKOV ZAKHAR'YEVICH ⁴	
(Jan.-Feb.)	PYOTR MIKHAYLOVICH	Z, P
(from Aug.)	Prince Danilo Aleksandrovich Penko Yaroslavsky ⁵	Z, P
	Prince Ivan Volodimirovich Lyko Obolensky	Z, P
(from Nov.)	PRINCE SEMYON ROMANOVICH [YAROSLAVSKY]	P
		DRK, p. 19; PSRL, VIII, p. 231
	Prince Danilo Aleksandrovich Penko Yaroslavsky	P
1496	PRINCE SEMYON ROMANOVICH	Z
1497	Prince Danilo Aleksandrovich Penko Yaroslavsky	Z, P
1498	ANDREY FYODOROVICH CHELYADNIN	Z
1499	ANDREY FYODOROVICH CHELYADNIN	Z, P
	Ivan Andreyevich Loban Kolychev	
1500	ANDREY FYODOROVICH CHELYADNIN	Z, P
(Dec.)	Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Nemoy Shuysky ⁶	Z
	Ivan Andreyevich Kolychev	Z, P

court administrator in Novgorod, even while Yakov Zakhar'yevich continued to lead the Novgorodian contingents on grand-princely wars. It should be noted further that Pyotr Pleshcheyev's appointment as second Novgorodian namestnik is the only known instance in Ivan III's reign when an okol'nicliy received such an assignment.

⁴ Yakov Zakhar'yevich was the senior Novgorodian governor until August. In that month the Muscovite forces attacked Vyborg. The boyar Prince Danilo Vasil'yevich Shchenya commanded the forces sent from Moscow. 'And from the Novgorodian lands the grand prince ordered [them] out against the Swedish Germans'. (DRK, p. 19). Then follows the listing of commanders of the five regiments, traditional for a Muscovite army. Yakov, as commander of the Novgorodian contingent, was appointed first voyevoda of the Great Regiment. Immediately after this information the following entry appears: 'A v Novgorode velikom velel kniaz' velikiy byt' namestnikom: Knyaz'yu Danilu Aleksandrovich Yaroslavskomu, da knyaz'yu Ivanu Volodimirovichu Lyko Obolenskomu'.

⁵ Prince Danilo Aleksandrovich Yaroslavsky was one of the namestniki who later attained boyar rank. The first notice of his promotion to the top echelon of the council is from February 1500 (DRK, p. 9; Zimin, 'Sostav', AE 1957, p. 47, n. 74). Prior to his appointment as namestnik in Novgorod, he had already performed military service against Lithuania (DRK, pp. 17, 18). His appointment in Novgorod was as a junior governor charged with viceregal responsibilities, while the senior governor fulfilled the military functions assigned to him by Ivan III.

⁶ This identification of Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Shuysky is a difficult one to make, in that there were three Shuysky princes with those forenames who could have been alive at this time. Vasily Vasil'yevich Blednoy does not appear in the service register of Ivan III. A second, nicknamed Grebenka, is a somewhat stronger possibility. In the 1450s he had commanded the Pskovian forces in the quality of a hired prince (*Pskovskie letopisi*, I, pp. 50-1). Later he became prince of the military in Novgorod the Great. Here he performed well but unsuccessfully, losing the Dvina land to the Muscovites in 1471 (*PSRL*, IV, p. 150), and in 1477/8 he had to surrender to the Muscovites when Novgorod's defeat seemed inescapable (*Pskovskie letopisi*, II, pp. 213-14). By 1479 Prince Vasily Shuysky, lacking other available means of earning his livelihood, made his peace with Ivan III. The politic grand prince accorded him honour and gifts (*PSRL*, VI, p. 216). A third Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Nemoy Shuysky is the likeliest candidate. He was the

1501 (Apr.–May)	PRINCE SEMYON ROMANOVICH YARO- SLAVSKY	Z, P
	Ivan Andreyevich Kolychev	
(Autumn–Dec.)	PRINCE DANILO VASIL'YEVICH SHCHENYA	DRK, p. 30, 31
	<i>Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Nemoy Shuysky</i>	DRK, p. 30, 31
1502 (Dec.)	PRINCE DANILO VASIL'YEVICH SHCHENYA	DRK, p. 32; P
	<i>Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Nemoy Shuysky</i>	DRK, p. 32; Z, P
1503 (Feb.)	<i>Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Nemoy Shuysky</i>	Z
1504 (May)	PRINCE DANILO VASIL'YEVICH SHCHENYA	PDS, I, p. 123
	<i>Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Nemoy Shuysky</i>	Z, P
1505 (June)	PRINCE DANILO VASIL'YEVICH SHCHENYA	Z, P
	<i>Prince Vasily Vasil'yevich Nemoy Shuysky</i>	Z, P

son of Vasily Fyodorovich Shuysky, who had been a junior namestnik in Novgorod in 1480/1 and served into the 1490s as prince of Pskov. This Vasily married Princess Anastasiya, daughter of the Kazan' tsarevich Pyotr (*Vremennik*, X, 'Materialy', p. 45), an act probably dictated by grand-princely politics. Moreover, this Vasily Shuysky became a boyar no later than 1512 (Zimin, 'Sostav', *AE* 1957, p. 50 and n. 105).